

all-American canal to Coachella Valley at the earliest possible date; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2365. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, urging the Government of the United States, through the appropriate agency, to make an immediate survey of the best available route to bring water from the Colorado River to the city of San Diego for the purpose of insuring adequate water supply which is vital to the war program and to the welfare of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps stationed in the Nation's most vital defense area; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2366. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, requesting the Federal employees retirement system initiate and the Congress of the United States enact legislation which will provide for employees of the State of California, who for years have been employees of the State, and who earned retirement rights by their service with the State, and who, by Presidential order, were made Federal employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2367. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, respectfully urging Congress and the President of the United States that they consider the necessity of the food industry during the war effort and that proper steps be taken to insure the industry that the draft law will not use up the personnel of the industry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2368. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, respectfully urging the President and Congress to amend the Federal Social Security Act by repealing amendments of 1939 thereto which prevent any State in the Union from allowing any additional income to the aged and to children beneficiaries thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2369. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, expressing its desire to do everything possible in the interest of successful military offensive by the United States of America, and urging Congress to provide necessary funds for the construction of needed defense projects relating directly to the Sacramento River and tributaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2370. Also, petition of the Assembly of the State of California, requesting the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to cause an immediate study of the defense project known as the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Breakwater, such study to be made by appropriate defense authorities, and to consider favorably the speeding up of said project; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2371. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, urging the President and Congress to consider and enact such amendments to the Federal Social Security Act as may be necessary to restore to the recipients of old-age assistance their former privilege of earning not more than \$15 per month without deduction from the amount of old-age assistance which they would otherwise receive; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2372. Also, petition of the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, urging the President and Congress to take such steps as will give the gold-mining industry sufficient materials, and priorities thereto, to permit its continued operation through the war emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2373. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California Retail Grocers and Merchants Association, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif., opposing the plan advanced by the Social Security Board for the taking over of the California

Unemployment insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2374. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the executive council, Wisconsin Bankers Association, and midwinter conference, Wisconsin Bankers' Association, that the President of the United States and each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Wisconsin be petitioned that proposed legislation in regard to Federal-State relationship in unemployment compensation to the end that 51 separate State and Territorial laws be destroyed and 1 Federal law substituted, to be deferred for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that our sympathies, supplications, and our sacrifices may be an inspirational might to our defenders on land, sea, and air; defend the sanctities of our faith with the assurance that our hope in them is neither a delusion nor fiction. As we lift our souls to Thee, we pray that their hearts may not be troubled, neither let them be afraid. For life's transitions, for its varying experiences, and for the path they need not tread alone, be their comfort beneath that guardian Rock where all commotions rest.

The recurrent sense of human frailty feelingly reminds us of the danger in which we walk. We pray to be made stronger, possessing the truth, clearly discerned, with our souls anchored to constant and unmovable foundations. With contrite hearts and with that grace which fortifies the soul, we beseech Thee that we may have an urgent determination to remember the blessing of sanctified duty. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of Edna La Blanche Gillette;

H. R. 1903. An act for the relief of Reuben Owen;

H. R. 1914. An act for the relief of the Coppel Coal Co.;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of Paul E. Cook;

H. R. 2376. An act for the relief of Ethel Ray Sowder;

H. R. 3118. An act for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund of California;

H. R. 3403. An act for the relief of Louis M. McDougal;

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of Mollie S. McHaney;

H. R. 4436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertha M. Smith;

H. R. 5046. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Saunders;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Esco Wood;

H. R. 5164. An act for the relief of Arthur W. Jorgenson, and the legal guardian of Robert R. Jorgenson, a minor;

H. R. 5291. An act for the relief of Helen Rauch and Max Rauch;

H. R. 5390. An act for the relief of G. T. Elliott, Inc.;

H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of Joseph Keeney;

H. R. 5701. An act for relief of the accounts of Lt. Col. Joseph M. Kelly, United States property and disbursing officer for Kentucky;

H. R. 5767. An act for the relief of A. Paul Johnson; and

H. R. 6356. An act to amend the act approved October 24, 1941, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes" (Public Law No. 280, 77th Cong.), so as to remove the limitation on the sum authorized to be appropriated annually to effectuate the purposes of the act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Hiram O. Lester, Grace D. Lester, and Florence E. Dawson;

H. R. 2712. An act for the relief of the Branchland Pipe & Supply Co.; and

H. R. 2780. An act for the relief of O. C. Ousley.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson;

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson;

S. 1898. An act for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Nazaria Garcia, of Winslow, Ariz.;

S. 2002. An act for the relief of Donald William Burt;

S. 2066. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products;

S. 2198. An act to provide for the financing of the War Damage Corporation to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Report of the Commission Appointed by the President of the United States To Investigate the Facts Relating to the Attack Made by the Japanese Armed Forces Upon Pearl Harbor in the Territory of Hawaii, on December 7, 1941.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2112. An act authorizing overtime pay for certain employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Labor.
2. Department of War.

3. Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board.

FINANCIAL AID TO CHINA

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 276, authorizing the President of the United States to render financial aid to China, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom]?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not propose to object—this is a very important resolution. It comes to the House with the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It involves \$500,000,000 to furnish aid to China. In my opinion, it is a proper and wise move and a sound military and diplomatic investment.

China has been fighting Japan with great gallantry for the last 4 or 5 years. It has a tremendous reservoir of manpower. It has a population of 457,000,000 people—3 or 4 times as many as the United States. The Congress and the American people are completely united in winning this war. If we want to be sure of winning it, what is better and wiser than to supply arms, ammunition, defensive and offensive weapons, airplanes, tanks, and artillery in large quantities to the Chinese, who have already shown the utmost gallantry, but who are lamentably lacking in artillery, airplanes, and modern weapons with which to defeat the Japanese?

When this resolution is passed—and I am sure it will pass unanimously—I hope we will proceed at the earliest possible moment to try to get airplanes, the best equipped and the most modern airplanes in the world, to the Chinese, so that they can carry the war to Japan—an offensive war from the shores of China across the seas to Japan—and bomb Japanese cities and destroy them as the Japs did to them.

We must not minimize this war. If China should be driven out of the war, if she should collapse, if she should make peace, if she should be beaten, I do not believe we could win the war for many years and without terrible losses and trials. If Russia should collapse or be forced to make peace, we would be confronted with an equally serious situation. I think we would then face the possibility of a stalemate. But as long as Russia and China remain in this war and continue to fight, we are bound to win, particularly if we supply them with weapons to fight with.

I hope there will be no objection to the resolution.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, this is an exceptionally fine movement for our Government to make?

Mr. FISH. And a vote of confidence for the present Chinese Government, which has been carrying on this war for 4 years without proper arms or equipment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course I am wholeheartedly for the resolution. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish] has said, we must not minimize the war.

There is one thing the American public must be watchful of, and that is an attitude of complacency. We cannot feel overconfident. On the other hand, we must not have a feeling of lack of confidence or defeatism. I think the state of mind of the American people must be one of grim determination. That state of mind must be possessed not only by the leaders in the armed forces, every member of the armed forces, but every civilian, because war today is an over-all picture; not alone the men in service who are waging the war. The child in the crib is in this war. After this war is over everyone, from the babe in the crib up, will be a veteran of this war. Civilian defense is a very important part of our war, and those in civilian life should actively participate in all such activities. If there is one thing we have learned from Pearl Harbor it is that we should be prepared for anything. We might think something may not happen, but we should not rest upon that thought and be inactive. We must be prepared for anything that can possibly happen.

As far as China is concerned, the American people have always had a warm feeling of friendship for the people of China and for the Chinese Government. Even before December 7 and our entry into the war, our people had a warm friendship for them and a strong feeling of support in their defense against aggression and in their future aspirations. Today we are allies, and our Government since December 7 and prior to that time has done everything possible, and our Government will do everything possible to assist the people of China, to assist the Government of China as an ally and as a friend in the successful termination of the war, to which we are all so anxiously looking forward to see brought about as soon as possible. This bill is a very important bill in connection with the defense of the people and the Government of China. It is an important bill from our own angle, and as a part of our war action in this great conflict. I know there is no opposition to this bill, but we want to have a record made of the love and affection on the part of the people of America for the people of China.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I subscribe to what our leader has just said that there is no opposition to this particular joint resolution, but I do want to say a word in reference to the plan he proposes. I am wondering if he thinks it is financially possible for the people of the United States to finance the war activities of every nation on the globe that is opposed to the Central Powers. I am wondering how far we can go—and he and the leadership of this Congress understand that there is a limit to the financial resources and productive ability of this country—

and now that we are committed to fight and win this war if it is not necessary to divert our resources and energies to equipping the military forces of our own country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas China has for more than 4 years valiantly resisted the forces of Japanese aggression; and

Whereas financial and economic aid to China will increase her ability to oppose the forces of aggression; and

Whereas the defense of China is of the greatest possible importance: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, is hereby authorized, on behalf of the United States, to loan or extend credit or give other financial aid to China in an amount not to exceed in the aggregate \$500,000,000 at such time or times and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President shall deem in the interest of the United States.

SEC. 2. The authority herein granted shall be in addition to any other authority provided by law.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, not to exceed \$500,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the resolution now under consideration—House Joint Resolution 276—I would like at this time to present the letter of the President of the United States which was sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives under date of January 31, 1942:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 31, 1942.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Responsible officials both of this Government and of the Government of China have brought to my attention the existence of urgent need for the immediate extension to China of economic and financial assistance going beyond in amount and different in form from such aid as Congress has already authorized. I believe that such additional assistance would serve to strengthen China's position as regards both her internal economy and her capacity in general to function with great military effectiveness in our common effort.

I urge, therefore, the passage by Congress of appropriate legislation to this effect and attach hereto a suggested draft of a joint resolution which would accomplish this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

During the hearing held by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 3, 1942, on this measure, the committee heard testimony from the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr.; the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson; the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox; the Secretary of Commerce, Jesse H. Jones; and Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long.

The witnesses discussed the background of our relations with China and detailed the recent political, military, and economic developments. In the opinion

of the committee these developments fully justify the financial aid which this joint resolution would authorize.

It was thought desirable that the Secretary of the Treasury, acting with the approval of the President, should be given the widest possible latitude in arranging for the financial aid to be extended. The joint resolution was deemed adequate to permit the Secretary of the Treasury, acting with the approval of the President, to accept any direct or indirect benefit to the United States as ample consideration for either part or the whole of the assistance to be extended to China.

The witnesses reported to the committee the various forms of credits and loans and aids that have heretofore been extended to China and the splendid record of the Chinese Government in discharging its obligations and commitments to the United States. The additional assistance now proposed is much more comprehensive in scope, and is of a different character from the stabilization loans, Export-Import Bank loans, and other economic aids. The aid contemplated in the joint resolution should be regarded as the financial counterpart of lend-lease war materials. It is designed to the same end—namely, the successful prosecution of the war and should be evaluated in the same terms.

From the beginning of the vicious onslaught in 1937 by the Japanese armed forces upon China, the Chinese Government, the Chinese people, and the Chinese armed forces have heroically and with great sacrifice resisted a ruthless invasion. The areas which Japan has succeeded in occupying have not been yielded until after the Chinese people have, with unbelievable sacrifice and fortitude, stripped them of materials that might be of value to the enemy. China, cut off from communication with the outside world except by long and difficult routes, deprived of its great industrial, shipping, and commercial centers, and denied the greater part of its normal sources of revenue, is continuing after almost 5 years a valiant fight against aggression. The tenacity of the Chinese in this battle for their national existence has won the unstinted praise of free peoples everywhere.

The country which attacked China in 1937 attacked the United States in 1941. That country and its partners in world crime declared war on the United States. This country thereupon declared war on them. China also declared war on them. Today the United States and China are actively engaged, along with other countries that have been attacked by the aggressor nations, as comrades in arms fighting for the same great purpose against common enemies. In the declaration of January 1, 1942, by the United Nations, the United States and China and their associates took a common pledge to cooperate fully to the end that the war against Japan and its partners should be successfully carried on to victory.

In essence, this measure of financial assistance is intended to contribute toward the same strengthening within China of the structure of economic, fi-

nancial, and production measures that is being found necessary within the United States for the pursuit and winning of the war.

The long historic association, cultural, educational, and economic, which has thrived between the United States and China since the early days of our Republic, is now further amalgamated in a common war effort. This measure will be a further manifestation of the unity of purpose, the tenacity, the faith, and the determination of the free nations that are united in defense of freedom.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of immediate passage of this bill. We have all admired the gallant and long-enduring fight that China has made. We should come to her aid in her time of need.

While it is rash to make predictions in time of war, I believe this loan or gift of \$500,000,000 to China will repay us many times over in helping us to win the war against the Axis Powers. I have no doubt but what China will carry on with the same stubborn resistance until we can give her the material and the machines to fight with which she so badly needs.

This financial aid will give her immediate assistance. I for one am glad she is going to get it and that this bill was passed by the unanimous vote of the Foreign Affairs Committee and of this House.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt and unanimous approval of this resolution, without further debate or discussion. Ordinarily I would oppose the consideration of such a gigantic authorization in this manner, but the situation in the Pacific clearly requires action, rather than words, in attempting to match with such aid as we can render the matchless aid to us which China is rendering.

There is no precedent for what we are doing here; there is no precedent in history for the unique friendship between our country and China; there is no precedent for the fight the Chinese have made under their great Chiang Kai-shek against odds that, according to all the precedents, were overwhelming.

I taught for a year at the college of Yale in China, in Changsha, the city in Hunan Province where the Chinese first defeated the Japanese in 1939 and where they have since administered four bloody defeats to the Japanese. Changsha is a symbol of defeat to the Japanese. The Japanese general who lost 100,000 men there has just committed suicide. I am proud to feel that I knew China and the Chinese in the very place where they have done their best. I know their capacity for stubborn, wily, effective resistance, their stout, fighting hearts. They are inherently democratic. They are our friends. Based on performance to date, they have been the most potent anti-Axis force on earth.

They know what total war is. We are just learning. This aid we are authorizing today is for more than lease-lend materials; it is a form of total aid to total friends against mortal enemies.

An oriental proverb says, "To give quickly is to give twice." The most we can do right now is to authorize this all-out, all-around financial aid. The least

we can do is to do it quickly without quibbling and without revealing to our enemies how it is to be used. The Chinese have developed oriental ways of defeating their oriental foe. We can most effectively show our appreciation of their effective resistance, which means so much to us, by helping them to continue their own kind of resistance in their own way.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the House today rose to the occasion and unanimously adopted a resolution authorizing a loan or grant to China of \$500,000,000. This was a vitally important action and one which I am sure will contribute very materially to a successful termination of the war effort.

By our action today, the Government of the United States and the people of the United States are showing to the Government of China and to the people of China that we are joined together in a single task; fighting the common enemy shoulder to shoulder and side by side; soldiers of China and soldiers of America fighting together; our resources and material wealth combined with the resources and material wealth of China; and, above all, with a spiritual determination common to the peoples of both countries to see the war through to victory. The limitless courage displayed by the army of the Republic of China has aroused the admiration of all governments and of all peoples throughout the world.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. HU SHIH

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the House today passed unanimously the bill authorizing a \$500,000,000 loan to China, my thoughts turned to one of the most refreshing and democratic gentlemen I have been privileged to meet in the Nation's Capital—Dr. Hu Shih, China's Ambassador to our country.

I came to know Dr. Hu only yesterday when at the Chinese Embassy I presented him with a suitably inscribed and beautifully bound tribute and certificate of membership in the Paterson, N. J., Y's Men's Club. Young men of this organization have studied the life of China's most distinguished scholar, educator, and historian, now representing his country in Washington, and they have been deeply impressed by his contributions to international amity.

I was humming Far Above Cayuga's Waters as Dr. Hu entered the reception room of the Embassy.

"Congressman, are you a Cornell man, too?" he asked smilingly.

I had to respond in the negative, but I did say I knew of his years at Ithaca.

A profound student of our American Government, Dr. Hu told me how, back in 1912 while at Cornell, he had subscribed to the New York Times, the New York Tribune, and the New York Journal in order to get "all possible slants on the Wilson, Roosevelt, and Taft campaigns."

The Ambassador was not pessimistic about the war. He did not feel victory was so remote. Proudly, he described the Chinese will to defeat their enemies. "We can do so much with a little help, a little equipment," he said. Dr. Hu, who looks more like 41 than 51, went on to say that his country was the first in Asia to work out a democratic form of government. Historical factors have

been at work for tens of centuries and have given the Chinese people the tradition and the preparation for the development of modern democratic institutions.

Of these institutions, the Doctor emphasized three: First, a thoroughly democratized social structure; secondly, 2,000 years of an objective and competitive system of examinations for civil service; and thirdly, the historic institution of the government creating its own opposition and censorial control.

Dr. Hu is worth knowing. I shall see him soon again. He told me on my leaving yesterday he was coming to Paterson in March or April personally to thank the Y's Men for remembering him.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed at this point in the Record for 3 legislative days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis]?

There was no objection.

PURCHASE OF GOVERNMENT BONDS BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday we appropriated \$1,450,000,000 for interest on the public debt. I hold in my hand a Federal Reserve note, on the face of which these words appear:

This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank.

All the resources and credit of the United States Government and the people stand behind this piece of paper, although this piece of paper and others like it can only be issued by the Federal Reserve Board and only to and for the benefit of privately owned Federal Reserve banks.

A bill will be brought on the floor of the House soon to provide that Federal Reserve banks may directly purchase Government bonds. I am not opposed to that, but may I say that the most elemental sense of justice ought to show us that not one dime interest should be paid on any bonds bought by the Federal Reserve banks from the Government of the United States. Federal Reserve credit is the credit of the American people. It is backed by the power to issue Federal Reserve notes, and Federal Reserve notes, as I have shown, must be redeemed "in lawful money" by the Treasury if anyone demands that that be done. What the

Federal Reserve banks will "lend" the Government when they buy the bonds is the credit of the Government itself, created upon the books of these banks for the explicit purpose of buying the bonds. To require the American people to pay interest on such a "loan" is nothing short of rank injustice and economic folly. If the Federal Reserve banks are to purchase any bonds from our Treasury, those bonds ought in all cases to be non-interest-bearing bonds. No other arrangement can be defended on grounds of equity or justice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT AND THE NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6460) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Scrugham]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6460) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "from time to time in whole or in part,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 5, 10, 25, 26, and 27.

J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
HARRY R. SHEPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
J. W. DITTER,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN H. OVERTON,
CARTER GLASS,
ELMER THOMAS,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
DAVID I. WALSH,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate

to the bill (H. R. 6460) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 23, and 24: Make textual transpositions, or correct spelling or punctuation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$958,979,-935 for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, 1943," as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$343,-079,935, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$615,000,000 being the subject of a supplemental estimate.

Amendment No. 8: Allows \$25 for an outfit of civilian clothing for men discharged other than honorably, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20, as proposed by the House. This applies to the fiscal year 1943.

Amendment No. 16: Empowers the President to suspend any part of section 109, dealing with employment in the Canal Zone, as proposed by the Senate, instead of empowering him to suspend the entire section, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$661,000,-000 for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, 1942," as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$332,-000,000, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$329,000,000 being the subject of a supplemental estimate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$2,057,-574,000 for "Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, 1942," as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,161,274,000, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$896,300,000 being the subject of a supplemental estimate.

Amendment No. 19: Allows \$25 for an outfit of civilian clothing for men discharged other than honorably, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20, as proposed by the House. This applies to the fiscal year 1942.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$4,408,-300,000 for "Aviation, Navy, 1942," as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$332,300,000, as proposed by the House, the increase of \$4,176,-000,000 being the subject of a supplemental estimate.

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22, relating to "Increase and replacement of naval vessels," provides that the appropriations under the subheads "Construction and machinery" and "Armor, armament, and ammunition," shall remain available until expended, as proposed by the Senate.

Disagreements pursuant to clause 2, rule XX
Amendment No. 2, relating to the Naval Research Laboratory.

Amendment No. 5, relating to flight pay to officers above the rank of captain.

Amendment No. 10, relating to the appropriation "Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks."

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26, relating to launching expenses, naval vessels.

Amendment No. 27, relating to the transfer of defense articles to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States.

J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JOSEPH E. CASEY,
HARRY R. SHEPARD,
ALBERT THOMAS,
J. W. DITTER,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
NOBLE J. JOHNSON,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when this bill left the House it carried appropriations totaling \$17,722,565,474. In addition, it carried contractual authorizations aggregating \$2,256,400,000.

The Senate has added to the bill \$6,-016,300,000 of cash and \$500,000,000 of

contractual authorization, and all of the cash is supported by a Budget estimate, which is contained in Senate Document No. 160.

Your conference committee has agreed to these supplemental amounts, so that if you support our action, the bill will carry a total of \$23,738,865,474 of cash and \$2,766,400,000 of contractual authorizations, or a grand total of \$26,495,265,474.

Of the cash, \$14,045,339,974 applies to the fiscal year 1943, and \$9,693,525,000 applies to the current 1942 fiscal year. The latter, added to prior appropriations, brings the 1942 total up to \$16,722,718,497.

Of the Senate increase, \$5,072,300,000 results from the enlarged airplane program, \$944,000,000 is for lend-lease employment, and the \$500,000,000 of contractual authority is for emergency public-works needs, principally the establishment of a major advance base depot on each coast, so that there will be in readiness a reservoir of men, equipment, and materials for dispatch to any theater where a need may arise for an advance base beyond our shores.

The airplane program calls for 23,354 additional planes. The bill as it left the House made provision for 1,709 additional planes. This is the Navy's part of the new airplane expansion program.

As the result of recent hearings and investigations of aviation matters, I am strongly impressed with the fact that our aeronautical chiefs have been remiss in failing to recognize fully the military importance of dive and torpedo bombers, by the use of which the havoc wrought at Pearl Harbor was largely accomplished.

While both our Army and Navy have used such maneuvers, and the dive bomber was largely originated by our naval and Marine Corps flyers, the responsible officers seem to have taken but few steps to prevent wholesale destruction of naval facilities from such sources.

It is true that some considerable increase in cost might have been involved, but the policy still persists of crowding almost unprotected facilities into a few limited areas, ostensibly for easier protection from sabotage. Nevertheless, it seems that mastery in the wars of the future will be settled by low-flying airplanes. Hangars, landing fields, and even manufacturing facilities when closely packed together only invite attack and destruction, as conclusively proven by results in Hawaii. Another item which cannot be too strongly emphasized is the obvious need for more unified command for both area forces and task forces, as evidenced by recent events. The same thing applies to procurement and production of munitions of warfare.

In conclusion, let me again call attention to the fact that the appropriation of \$26,000,000,000, agreed to in this report, has the unanimous support of the committee. If wisely spent and used, it should insure this Nation the full, ultimate mastery in this mighty struggle for preservation of democratic institutions.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: Page 6, line 1, insert a colon after the figures and the following proviso: "Provided, That the compensation of the position of senior head physicist shall be at the rate of \$8,000 per annum so long as such position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 19, line 24, after the word "for," strike out the words "making aerial flights by more than nine officers above the rank of captain, nor by non-flying officers or observers at rates in."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCRUGHAM moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 5 with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "making aerial flights by more than 23 officers above the rank of captain, flight orders in the case of all flag officers to be subject to the specific approval of the Secretary of the Navy (except for 4 of such 23 officers, namely, the Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, the commandant, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., the commanding officer, Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Tex., and the commanding officer, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla., each of the other 19, to be entitled to flight pay, shall be required to certify, or to have their immediate superiors certify, that during the period in which aerial flights were made extraordinary hazards were incurred), nor by."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 10: Page 34, line 2, after the figures, insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for Public Works equipment, materials, and construction in an amount not to exceed \$500,000,000, which amount shall be in addition to all other amounts herein or heretofore appropriated under this title."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: On page 73, in line 20, strike out "No" and insert the following: "Except in amounts limited by the Secretary of the Navy, not exceeding \$25 in any one instance, no."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 26: Page 74, line 1, after "appropriated", insert the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall determine the nature and extent of any ceremonies in connection with the launching of any vessel either in public or private ship-building plants."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Page 74, after line 6, insert the following:

"TITLE III—DEFENSE AID

"SEC. 301. Whenever the President deems it to be in the interest of national defense, he may authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease for such period of time not exceeding the duration of the existing national emergency ships appropriated for in whole or in part in this act under the heading, 'Increase and replacement of naval vessels, emergency construction,' or to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, any other defense article procured from funds appropriated in this act, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 11, 1941 (Public Law 11): *Provided*, That the total value of articles, other than ships, disposed of under this authority shall not exceed \$2,000,000,000."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCRUGHAM moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 27 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: Change the amount before the period at the end of said amendment to "\$2,500,000,000."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my happy privilege to be able to say for the minority, that in line with the minority leadership in the House, the Republicans are giving their full support to the present conference report, which provides the necessary funds for the Naval Establishment.

I feel that I am not at all guilty of boastfulness when I say on behalf of the minority that it contributed in no small way to the successful steering of this appropriation bill through the House.

I feel called upon to make this observation at this time because of the effort which has been made in the last few days to question the motives of the minority in connection with the national defense program. Such an attack can certainly serve no good purpose with those who have our national interests at heart, or who realize the magnitude of our undertaking, or who, with devotion and unselfishness are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to win the war. The motive behind the attack is apparent. It is obvious, of course, to everyone. I shall leave to others the decision as to the worthiness of the effort. But I am confident that it will not be successful.

The minority has not deviated in the pledge which it has made to give its support to the successful prosecution of the war, a pledge of loyalty and a pledge of devotion. No better evidence of our attitude need be introduced than the contribution which we have made in connection with the appropriation bill for the Navy, the conference report on which is now before the House. Before the bar of public opinion and to an informed citizenry the record of our contribution will be far more convincing than the palpably plain efforts of the last few days. And what is more important, those who are concerned, genuinely and honestly concerned, about our defense and security will be far more assured by the unanimity of our endeavors to provide the necessary funds for ships and planes and guns than they could be by the hollowness of empty words and idle phrases.

Let it be remembered that something other than political strategy will be necessary in the winning of this war, and the American people are becoming increasingly aware of it.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the amendment presently before us, this amendment is in line with the amendment contained in the third supplemental bill of last year. If it is enacted operation of the Lease-Lend Agency will not be necessary. It seems to me, therefore, that we should take notice of the decreasing amount of work for which lease-lend activity is responsible and in the measure by which that activity is decreased we should proceed to pare down the personnel, the employed individuals, and, as a result, reduce the administrative cost.

Mr. Speaker, I join wholeheartedly with the distinguished chairman of the committee in endorsing the conference report before us, which has the entire support of the minority.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this bill now carries appropriations of \$23,700,000,000 and with contract authority in the bill amounts to \$26,500,000,000. It is the largest bill that has ever gone through a legislative body at any one time in the history of the world, either in America or in any other nation, and it seems to go through here with apparent ease. It is a sum equal to our national debt after World War No. 1. We all trust the committee and let it ride through. The bill is really so big there is no one man who can fathom what it actually means. It is a real Roosevelt bill in all the orgy of spending.

In this bill you are appropriating \$2,000,000,000 additional for the President of the United States to give away under the Lease-Lend Act. This makes a total of \$21,000,000,000 since last July that we have given the President of the United States to give away to other nations. You may call it a lease-lend bill; I think I have termed it correct.

The point I want to make is this: This morning I heard on the radio a statement that China is dissatisfied because it is not getting supplies from America fast enough, and that Russia is dissatisfied because it is not getting the supplies it

thinks it should from the United States. Other nations will soon be dissatisfied if we are not able to give them what they think America should give them. You have promised them too much and are still making promises.

We have been the greatest Santa Claus in the world in the last 10 years to our own people and to other nations of the world, and now if we start out with these huge, fabulous appropriations to be Santa Claus to all the people and nations of the world, you will wreck America completely. Instead of bringing other nations of the world up to the standard America has set—and we have always prided ourselves on the fact that we have established a high standard of living in America for the world—we shall drag America down to the lowest standard of living among the nations of the world. We shall not only drag our country down to that standard but we shall ruin the American form of government and the American system. That is coming fast, and the New Deal is and will be responsible for the condition we will find ourselves in.

The people of this country are going to be compelled to sacrifice as they have never sacrificed before. The sad part of it will be that America, instead of being the grand Santa Claus, will be damned because it cannot continue to keep up that pace for years and years to come—not only to our own people but to all of our Allies. That is the situation with which we are confronted. That is the situation in which we shall eventually find ourselves. Then you will be unable to get out from under, and we will go broke, and great will be the fall of America and the American people—terrible to think about.

I say to the Congress that we are in war. It behooves you and me and every one of us to do everything we can to win this war; but you ought to be exceedingly careful in the promises you are making to all the countries of the world, in order that you may be able to fulfill the promises that men in authority of our Government make to other nations, so that these people will not be misled by statements made by men in high authority that cannot be fulfilled by the American Congress or the people of the United States. I do not care who the man is, he ought to weigh his words in making promises today.

The President and his Cabinet should lay in the lap of Congress his promises to all nations. We should look them over and see if we can fulfill them. The President has been a good liver and a good giver of other people's moneys and goods. When the President cannot fulfill his promises, what then? How can the American people stand to have any more burdens placed upon them? How much more can the President give away above the \$21,000,000,000 Congress placed in his hands? How long, oh, how long, can we go on this way? There must be a place to stop. Why not now? Why not try to figure again that to save 10 pennies make a dime, 10 dimes make a dollar? All you seem to know about appropriations today is billions. I cannot understand it. This bill is \$26,500,000,-

000—the largest bill of all history of all nations of the world.

We want to help every nation in the world that is allied with us to a successful conclusion of this great war effort. But certainly we have got to do a great deal to make our own defense solid so that we may come back at any enemy that may attack us. It seems to me this is the first responsibility of the Congress. Then let us do everything we can to help every nation under the sun that is fighting with us to bring about that end; but do it with a degree of sanity and with respect for America, the American form of government, and the American people, who will have to pay the bill eventually, if they can do it, or else you will put the Nation in the position where it cannot or will not be done, and that position will be bankruptcy. In the name of America, get some sense, some common sense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, regardless of what others have said, so there may be no misunderstanding about this situation in the minds of the minority Members of the House and the people of the country, I want to make this statement, and make it strong: While I favor such aid as is required to be furnished to Great Britain, to China, to Russia, or to any other country that is fighting the Axis Powers, I do not want anybody to get any idea that the major brunt of this conflict will not have to be carried by our own troops, our own sailors, and that the major blows will not have to be delivered by us with our own guns, with our own planes, with our own ships, and with our own tanks, operated by our own men. There is not any use in fooling ourselves. This is what is going to win the war, and we have got to provide for that, and provide for it to the limit. We are in this battle; it is a hard fight; we can win, and we are going to win.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the several motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SATTERFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short resolution pertaining to flood control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two editorials that appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement made by the highway users in regard to the importance of transportation to our war effort.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Examiner entitled "Defended—the West Coast Must Be Impregnable."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT POLK AND THE MEXICAN WAR

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to quote from a speech delivered by Abraham Lincoln on January 12, 1848, as a Member of the House of Representatives, criticizing President Polk for having provoked the Mexican War:

There is an important sense in which the Government is distinctive from the administration. One is perpetual; the other temporary and changeable.

A man may be loyal to his Government, and yet oppose the peculiar principles and methods of the administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of rubber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a letter written by me to the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOPS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 5833, to extend the time during which orders and marketing agreements under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, may be applicable to hops, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 8 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, by including hops as a commodity to which orders under such act are applicable', approved April 13, 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out 'September 1, 1942', and inserting in lieu thereof 'September 1, 1945.'

"Sec. 2. Subsection (6) of section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is amended by deleting the comma after the word 'hops' in the first paragraph thereof and inserting the words 'and their products' and a comma.

"Sec. 3. Subsection (6) of section 8c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, is further amended by adding thereto the following new paragraph:

"(F) In the case of hops and their products, in addition to, or in lieu of, the foregoing terms and conditions, orders may contain one or more of the following:

"(i) Limiting, or providing methods for the limitation of, the total quantity thereof, or of any grade, type, or variety thereof, produced during any specified period or periods, which all handlers may handle in the current of or so as to burden, obstruct, or affect interstate or foreign commerce in hops or any product thereof.

"(ii) Apportioning, or providing methods for apportioning, the total quantity of hops of the production of the then current calendar year permitted to be handled equitably among all producers in the production area to which the order applies upon the basis of one or more or a combination of the following: The total quantity of hops available or estimated will become available for market by each producer from his production during such period; the normal production of the acreage of hops operated by each producer during such period upon the basis of the number of acres of hops in production, and the average yield of that acreage during such period as the Secretary determines to be representative, with adjustments determined by the Secretary to be proper for age of plantings or abnormal conditions affecting yield; such normal production or historical record of any acreage for which data as to yield of hops are not available or which had no yield during such period shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the yields of other acreage of hops of similar characteristics as to productivity, subject to adjustment as just provided for.

"(iii) Allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the quantity of hops which any handler may handle so that the allotment fixed for that handler shall be limited to the quantity of hops apportioned under preceding section (ii) to each respective producer of hops; such allotment shall constitute an allotment fixed for that handler within the meaning of subsection (6) of section 8a of this title."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Is this the same bill that passed the House recently by unanimous consent?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes; this is the hops bill.

Mr. HOPE. And some amendments were inserted in the Senate that do not substantially change the character of the bill, which are in the main clarifying?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes. This is the same bill that we passed, with a few amendments added by Senator McNARY in the Senate.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial appearing in the Evening Star newspaper of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees.

Mr. MCCORMACK (when the Committee on Education was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the committees on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this to get the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, and ask him to state if he can the program for tomorrow and the rest of the week.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the bill S. 2150, the so-called guayule bill, respecting rubber, will be under consideration. I received a letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture several days ago stating that if the Congress was going to pass this bill it should be passed very shortly otherwise there would be delay of a year. Therefore I think it had better come up tomorrow, there being no other business.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the so-called Anderson bill?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes; it is a bill introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]. The bill has reference to the production of rubber, and, as I understand it, authorizes the purchase of plants to the extent of \$2,000,000. What the merits of the bill are I do not know. On Friday there will be a deficiency appropriation bill. I see the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I do not know whether there is going to be any controversy over that deficiency appropriation bill or not.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid there will be.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I had a suspicion of that kind, but I wanted to get that in the RECORD, so that the Members would have advance notice. So far as next week is concerned, I have nothing on the program now. Whatever program we do have will be with complete regard to the fact that Thursday is Lincoln's birthday and that Members, particularly on the Republican side, have very important speaking engagements on that date.

Then the following Sunday is Washington's birthday, celebrated on Monday, and then the Democrats have many important speaking engagements on that day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to express my appreciation of the fairness of the gentleman from Massachusetts in looking out for our interests.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman very much, but it is the thing that should be done.

I understand there will be no appropriation bill next week. The only possible bill that may come up, and I doubt if it will, would be a bill to authorize an appropriation of \$300,000,000 in connection with the workers displaced as a result of the war conditions. However, my personal opinion is that that bill probably would not be acted upon in time to be brought up next week. It is my intention to take up nothing after Wednesday, and I know of nothing coming up before Wednesday.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. After reading Mr. Flynn's address night before last, will the Republicans have any right to say anything whatever at the Lincoln Day banquets with reference to any Republican coming back to Congress? From what Mr. Flynn said there should be no politics—

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, the gentleman is asking me a question and making a speech.

Mr. RICH. Well, he damned the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN—

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, the gentleman is leading with his chin. I do not want to hit him. I like him too much.

Mr. RICH. I think we should have a right to get back at him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

FRED FARNER AND DORIS M. SCHROEDER

Mr. RAMSPECK submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3141) for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder, for printing in the RECORD.

CATHARINE SCHULTZE

Mr. RAMSPECK submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4622) for the relief of Catharine Schultze for printing in the RECORD.

ENEMY ALIENS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make certain observations with respect to the alien population within the United States, with respect to alien detention camps which are being set up, and with reference to activities of our Government along those lines.

At the outset, I want to compliment the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Francis Biddle, for his very fine and fair stand on the alien problem. He is trying to do a big job.

In the first place, we have a number of law-abiding aliens who, in my opinion,

could be a great asset to the United States in helping us to win this war. There are a number of aliens from the Axis countries with brains, with ability, with courage, who are praying and begging to serve this country of ours in this crucial time of need. They can and are willing to contribute their great share to the winning of this war, yet under proceedings instituted by the Government we classify those people as alien enemies just because they happen to have been born in a country with which we are at war.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some sort of a special bureau to register all aliens of the Axis countries and then to segregate the good from the bad, in order that the American people in this country will know just how bad the bad ones and how good the good ones are. If those aliens who are supposed to be real enemy aliens are dangerous, they ought to be immediately removed, and at the earliest possible time, to such points or places where they can do no harm. But it seems to me that we are going too far—and I do not believe this to be for the best interests of our country—by classifying all aliens, just because of birth in certain countries, as enemy aliens. In our great struggle against intolerance and bigotry we should not punish people who have come here to escape the forces we are fighting against, but make use of the talents and craftsmanship of such people, who are anxious and willing to help this country in its fight for democracy.

The committee of which I am chairman is receiving a great number of communications propounding many questions dealing with this problem, but we are unable to answer those questions. Some of the people claim they have certain qualifications which would be very useful in defense of our democracy if they were given an opportunity to serve this country. Yet I am told by a reliable source that we are going so haywire on this alien-enemy situation that we are taking the good and the bad and sending them to some island—Ellis Island or some other camp in this country. In one special case I am informed that the son of such an alien is now a draftee in the service of our country. Yet the father was taken in as an alien enemy.

In other cases where children were born of American wives the husband is taken in as an enemy alien. Yet in those very cases, if opportunity was afforded, or some group or committee would give the matter more careful study, we could easily segregate the bad from the good, and not classify every alien, just because he happens to be born in Germany or Italy, as an enemy alien. I have tried for many years even before we entered the war to make a study of this question. I hope to present sometime today or tomorrow a resolution to the Congress which will be referred undoubtedly to the Committee on Rules. I appeal to the Committee on Rules to give to the Committee on Immigration the opportunity to present a resolution which will authorize that committee to make a study of all these questions, whether they be in New York, California, or any other part of the country, and set up machinery so that we, the American people, may give to the people

who come here to our shores, and who deserve it, the same privileges that we have as Americans to worship our flag and also give them an opportunity to do their duty in joining the fight for the protection of this flag. We believe that the cooperation of some of these aliens may prove very helpful to our country in this particular time of need.

I have come across certain cases where scientists and engineers of great ability, people who can add greatly to our defense in an advisory capacity—and they are willing to serve in any capacity so long as it will destroy the Axis countries—have volunteered their services and have been refused because they are aliens or because they are called alien enemies.

I know a number of good men in this country who tried to join the intelligence service of our Government, and they could not serve our Government because they were not third-generation Americans. That is where our trouble was at Pearl Harbor, in my opinion. What difference does it make whether we allow first- or second-generation Americans to join? The question involved is whether the man is capable and can serve our country. We should not lay down ironclad rules that one cannot join a certain service until it is shown that his great grandfather was born over here. That is beyond my conception of constitutional prerogatives.

The whole alien question is presently so complicated that we do not know where we are going. We must have a strong arm on the battlefield and on the oceans; we must also have a strong united country, and, if necessary, make strong even those who are not yet citizens of the United States but who are more than willing to be when the proper time comes and who on the other hand are ready to serve this country, if necessary, and give up their lives in its defense.

I should like to have the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization make this study, and I hope and trust the House will be receptive to this resolution which we all feel is most urgent and necessary at this time. We have to take stock in this country. We have to find out now who are the alien enemies and who are the good aliens and separate them. We can very easily obtain a proper register and find out which of the good aliens have brains and abilities so that they may join us in the defense of our democracy. Only then can we have unity among our own people.

You take a situation where the head of a family was taken from his home because he happens to have been born in Germany or Italy, with an American wife and children waiting for their father—there cannot be much unity. That has occurred often in the last few months. I am not criticizing the Department of Justice, I am not criticizing any governmental department that wishes to label anyone as an alien enemy, but, Mr. Speaker, we must all realize that we are in a war and that we must win this war. We cannot have strife within our own borders, we cannot drive four or five million aliens from pillar to post if they are good people. Let us lend them a hand, let us permit them to join in some capacity in the defense

of our country, whether it is in the building of planes or ships, and if we are willing to trust them they are ready to go to the battlefield with the other soldiers to fight for this beloved country of ours.

I know the Members of the Congress are busy and they have not the time to study these questions as we of the Committee on Immigration must do. We get these matters day in and day out. Questions come up that are impossible to answer. I say in all fairness to all of you—for the best interests of America, the committee that is responsible for the legislative program should be given an opportunity to study these problems and make such recommendations to the Congress as it deems proper, with only one purpose in view, that is to win the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a table on the accidents at various intersections in the city of Washington during 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, when everything is cleaned up, I may be allowed to address this House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK]?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this Nation in company with other countries, is engaged today in a titanic struggle. The successful prosecution of the war will bring eventually freedom, not only to the people of our own Republic, but also countless millions of other individuals throughout the world.

I do not attempt to pose as a military strategist. I do feel, however, that the Members of the Congress of the United States, including myself, in company with a great many men and women in private life, are called on to survey most carefully the deliberations and action of those charged with preparing our military machine for possible conflict, and also to place certain responsibility on the shoulders of those who are to carry forward any war in which this Nation is a participant.

AIR POWER MUST BE RECOGNIZED

For many, many years in the Congress of the United States there has been discussion, at times heated and at times rather passive, as to the place the air force should have in the successful prose-

cution of a conflict in which America might be engaged. With this thought in mind, and relying on the facts and not on the fancies of wars that have been fought in the past, particularly the one which is now going on and in which we very lately are an active participant, there has been every indication that we in the United States are failing to give full recognition to the strength and the force which can come with building our air power to its ultimate degree.

In company with other Members of this body, I have from time to time presented statements from the well of this House on the vital need for revamping our defense set-up. I have also addressed communications to committees and introduced bills expressing my own thoughts in connection with this subject matter. I have spoken at public meetings and over the radio in a further attempt to get action and create sentiment.

I do not rise today to point the finger of criticism at any Member or any committee of this House. What I shall say will be in the kindest spirit. I recognize always the proprieties that are observed in this body, proprieties that very properly should continue to exist and I am certain will; but when there is a question so important as the organization of our national defense, then it seems to me that a Member denied the opportunity to present legislation he sponsors before the committee of this House to which those bills have been referred, can very rightly discuss what has taken place.

HEARINGS DENIED ALMOST 1 YEAR

At this point I desire to read portions of a letter, perhaps all of it. It is as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1942.

HON. JAMES A. O'LEARY,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures
in the Executive Departments,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I again respectfully direct your attention to repeated requests for a hearing on H. R. 3795 which I introduced in the House on March 4, 1941. This measure had been previously introduced by me in the Seventy-sixth Congress on August 15, 1940, and was numbered H. R. 10364. Under dates of March 6, 1941, March 24, 1941, and May 6, 1941, I asked for the opportunity of presenting arguments by myself and others on this measure to establish a Department of National Defense, to consolidate therein the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes. I deeply regret that I have not received answers to these communications.

It was my desire to do nothing which would appear or tend to disrupt our defense effort. Our paramount consideration must be the successful prosecution of the war. Certain of my colleagues and others had felt that although this legislative proposal had merit and should be thoroughly discussed it was not the opportune time to conduct hearings. With the publication of the Roberts' report it would seem that the situation in this respect has materially changed. Confusion instead of coordination was listed as a real reason for failure to be on the alert in the Pacific. Senator NORRIS yesterday stated, according to an Associated Press dispatch, "Congress can't escape its part of the blame. Long ago it should have streamlined our military organization." His opinion is shared by many others, including Representative COLLINS who is reported in an interview

yesterday as having stated, "Any nation that fails to provide a unified command is ignoring every lesson of modern war and is most likely preparing itself for defeat."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would rather conclude the letter, but I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION ON HEARING

Mr. BENDER. I am a member of the committee to which the gentleman refers. The gentleman's letter was read at a meeting of the committee this morning. The gentleman's bill is one of 9 or 10 similar measures we have before us. The chairman of the committee assured the committee that he would set a time for a hearing, possibly within a very few days, in connection with the matter the gentleman is calling to our attention at this time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am a member of that committee also, and I take issue with what the gentleman said, that the chairman of the committee stated that he would set this matter down for hearing in the very near future. When I was chairman of that committee we held a hearing upon this very subject. It is printed. Action was taken on the pending bills by the committee and every one of them was indefinitely postponed.

The committee took the position at that time that this country is at war and that the President under his war powers has the power if he so desires to create a department of national defense or to create a separate air force. It was at my suggestion that no hearing was set on the bills, but the matter was to be taken up in executive session after we had a report from the departments.

As far as I am concerned, this country being at war, it is my view that we should let the Army and Navy run this war. I propose to oppose even a hearing at this time, because the men who would have to come before that committee at such a hearing are needed to run this war.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield again to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman's understanding is slightly different from mine. A hearing was suggested and it was understood that the committee would hold an executive session and at that time would ask the various departmental heads to submit statements and appear before the committee and at the same time have statements from the gentlemen who introduced the resolutions.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will pardon me—

REQUEST WAS MADE PRIOR TO WAR

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman, but I must direct his attention again to the fact I urged hearings many months before we were in war.

Mr. COCHRAN. I offered the substitute myself after the gentleman requested a hearing be held. I merely suggest-

ed that the bill go to the War Department and the Navy Department and if the committee did hold a hearing for them to designate who was to appear before the committee. But I made it plain when the reports come back you are going to have a quorum, you are going to have an executive session of the committee, and it is my purpose to do everything I can to prevent even a hearing on it.

Mr. BENDER. I may say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Missouri is always in attendance at committee meetings, as is the gentleman who is now addressing the House. However, it is unfortunate that so many of our members do not attend meetings and we fail to have a quorum.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not criticizing the members for not being present. I am glad they were not there this morning, because I would have made a point of order that no quorum was present, if that had been necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. I want to add further, if the gentleman will yield—

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I do not know what the gentleman from Missouri wants. He said he would not complain about a quorum not being there, and yet he calls the attention of the House to the fact that a quorum was not present. I would like him to tell us just what he has in mind. On the one hand, he tells us a quorum was not present, and, on the other hand, when I referred to the fact that a quorum was not present, he said he would not call the attention of the House to the fact that a quorum was not present. I am trying to be agreeable, but it is very difficult to be agreeable with the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I desired to convey the impression by making that statement that if it was necessary I would have made a point of order that a quorum was not present and no action could have been taken at that time as to agreeing to hold a hearing.

Mr. BENDER. I can assure the gentleman, as a member of the committee, that the matter the gentleman complains of will be considered by the committee at its next meeting.

Mr. COCHRAN. And I can assure the gentleman I will do everything I can to let the people who are fighting this war fight it and not be called upon to fight it on the floor of the House or in the committee rooms.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the colloquy between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. They are both active members of the committee to which I have referred, and both are personal friends of mine. I should like to have the attention of the

gentleman from Missouri for just a moment, because I want to reiterate my words of a few minutes ago. I was attempting no criticism of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, but simply wished the RECORD to disclose that I directed three communications to the chairman of that committee, none of the letters being given a reply.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would like to say to the gentleman that the chairman of the committee advised the committee he had given a verbal reply to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. More than 8 months ago I was told the matter would be considered after the Army and Navy had reported on my bill. I was further assured that information had been requested. Since this phase appears in the debate, I believe I shall place those letters of request in the RECORD at this point, but will not take time to read them. I also desire to include a letter to Congressman SABATH. In company with other Members I appeared before the Rules Committee, seeking to have a special committee or a standing committee hold hearings.

MARCH 6, 1941.

HON. JAMES A. O'LEARY,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures
in the Executive Departments,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN O'LEARY: March 4, I introduced H. R. 3795, which was referred to your committee. I would deeply appreciate a hearing just as soon as possible on this measure, as I believe it is vitally important, and I would like the opportunity of presenting the reasons for its passage and producing witnesses in support of the bill.

Thanking you, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

MARCH 24, 1941.

HON. JAMES A. O'LEARY,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures
in the Executive Departments,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN O'LEARY: Following up my letter of March 6, and recalling our conversation on the House floor, I trust you can arrange in the very near future to set a date for hearings on H. R. 3795. I would like to know several days in advance, so that I can arrange for the witnesses to appear.

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

MAY 6, 1941.

HON. JAMES A. O'LEARY,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures
in the Executive Departments,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: Following my letters to you of March 6 and 24, let me say I am at a loss to understand why I have not received a reply regarding my bill H. R. 3795. Since writing these letters I have introduced another bill on this subject, H. R. 4532, which is also pending before your committee.

I am very deeply interested in this matter and most anxious to have a hearing held. I shall appreciate your advising me if this can be done.

Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

AUGUST 5, 1941.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: Interest in the subject of a separate air force for America continues to grow. This is true among the Members of Congress and the public generally. Action should no longer be delayed.

I had hoped that a thorough study of the matter would be made by either a standing committee of the House or a specially appointed group. However, this now appears unlikely and, since the hearing before your committee on July 29, it has occurred to me that the subject might properly be referred to the select committee, headed by Mr. Nichols, which is now conducting an investigation of commercial aviation.

I therefore request that the above-mentioned committee be authorized and instructed to make a thorough survey and report on the feasibility of setting up the air force as a separate branch of the Government. In view of the increased work this would imply, it might be advisable to add two members to the group. Of course, this could be determined after consulting with Representative NICHOLS. I feel in this way something really constructive can be accomplished.

It seems to me that the above-designated committee members are in a position to make a thorough and far-reaching survey. I feel that the report they would make on the practicability of setting up the air force as a separate unit would be most constructive. I am sending a copy of this letter to Congressman NICHOLS, and I shall appreciate your advising me of your reaction.

With kind personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, M. C.

The letter of January 28, 1942, from which I have read, received a reply.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just one moment?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. Another reason I advanced why I did not think it was proper to hold a hearing at this time was that no matter what action the Committee or the House might take, the action of the Senate Committee in unanimously refusing to hold a hearing on such legislation clearly indicates to me that there never will be any action at this session of the Congress by the Senate committee. So why waste our time by considering bills of that character?

RESPONSIBILITY MUST BE DISCHARGED

Mr. RANDOLPH. I genuinely respect the opinion of the gentleman from Missouri, but each Member of this House has a responsibility to discharge for himself. That is what I am attempting to do in this matter, as it concerns me personally.

I now continue with the letter, which I was reading when interrupted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

This type of legislation should not, in my considered opinion, be brought before the House for debate until after exhaustive committee consideration. I have thus hesitated to place a discharge petition on the Speaker's desk so that Members could in a concrete manner indicate their support of the needed change.

I digress from the reading of the letter to say that in my service as a Member of this House, for some 9 years, I quite understand the futility of a petition

placed on the Speaker's desk. I think only in the case of wage and hour legislation, and the so-called soldiers' bonus bill, was that avenue of approach successful in bringing action by this House. Continuing the reading of the letter:

If no hearings are to be held, however, it would appear that this is our only recourse. It is my urgent request, therefore, that a frank and full hearing now be held. Delay in reorganization of our fighting machine can be disastrous. Modern warfare is a job of large scale organization, which demands the creation of a single department of national defense with the branches of air, sea, and land under a unified command which will insure their complete team work and effectiveness against the enemies America faces in this bitter struggle.

I trust I may be favored with a reply at your earliest convenience.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

I received a letter under date of February 2, 1942, from the chairman of the committee, which stated that there would be a meeting of the committee this morning, and to which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] have both referred. I place that in the RECORD at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1942.
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am in receipt of your letter of January 28 with reference to your bill, H. R. 3795, to establish a separate air force.

At the last meeting of the committee, all bills concerning the establishment of a separate air force and bills consolidating various agencies were indefinitely postponed.

However, a meeting of the Expenditures Committee will be held on Wednesday, February 4, at 10 a. m., room 304, at which time your letter will be submitted for the consideration of this committee.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. O'LEARY.

GENERAL ARNOLD ENDORSES PLAN

Mr. Speaker, the man who is preeminent today in the formulation of our air policy, the man who is charged primarily with responsibility of building our air forces, is a keen student of military strategy. I refer to General Arnold, a splendid man. For the RECORD, I desire the House and the country to read what General Arnold said in 1935 on this subject, when he was giving testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee, at the time the late John J. McSwain, of South Carolina, was chairman of that group. Chairman McSwain said this to General Arnold:

Some of us have heard of you, and I want to ask you to speak out your own heart and mind, and give us your personal conviction with regard to the necessity for independent and increased air power in the defense of America.

General Arnold replied in these words:

I can see now where you can hitch a 1,000-mile plane on the operation of the Army or the Navy today. I cannot see how, if you are going to use a 3,000-mile bombing plane,

you can hitch that onto the Army or the Navy for all of its purposes. Then, I cannot see how you can hitch its activities on either the Army or the Navy, and beyond that, dreaming a little further, you can have an 8,000-mile plane, and then I know well you cannot hitch it onto either the Army or Navy activities. It is something beyond the scope of either one.

Continuing the testimony of General Arnold, I quote:

In order to get a properly trained and effective department of national defense, you have got to have three arms—land, sea, and air—equally self-supporting. I am of opinion that some time in the future this thing called a department of national defense is bound to come.

That was 7 years ago. General Arnold spoke with courage and foresight. His words were true then and are a thousandfold true today. A member who has deep convictions on this subject who would not arise in his place, after he has exhausted every other means to bring about a hearing, would be derelict in his duty, in my opinion. I shall place in the RECORD at the close of my speech certain other expressions of leading airmen who are enthusiastic for a unified command, through a department of national defense, and also certain speeches I have delivered on the subject by radio.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with everything the gentleman has to say about General Arnold's testimony some years ago. I assume the gentleman is reading from a page of Aero Digest; is he not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is true. Frank A. Tichenor is its editor, and he is in the forefront of this battle to bring about the desired change.

Mr. STEFAN. I wonder if the gentleman would put in that entire page in connection with his address?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I was going to select pertinent parts, but since the gentleman makes a pertinent request I will, with the permission of the Chair, use the same in its entirety.

Mr. STEFAN. The Aero Digest has recently been publishing some valuable information regarding the thing the gentleman is now discussing and in connection with that they have been bringing to light the wonderful work that is being done by the civilian pilot training organization. I believe the pages which the gentleman is reading from will cover a statement in that regard in which the Members will be very much interested.

MANY PERSONS CARRY ON THE FIGHT

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and wish to add that many other aviation and general magazines have joined in carrying forward this fight. All praise to men like Al Williams, De Seversky, and Roscoe Turner, and others, for driving ahead with cogent reasons for an air force of unified command.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to refresh the gentleman's mind again that the late Speaker, Joe L. Byrns, of Tennessee, had some similar ideas to which my colleague from West Virginia is referring today, that we should combine some of our armed forces into one national defense for the purpose of efficiency.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for calling attention to our former beloved Speaker, whom I greatly admired and counted as a real friend. He visited with me in my district.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I want to make one observation, and that is that I congratulate the gentleman from West Virginia for his persistent and aggressive fight on behalf of an independent air force and for his understanding of the problems of aviation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is very gracious to me. I genuinely appreciate his expression.

I would like to conclude with the words of Col. William L. Mitchell, written for Aero Digest in 1926. It is reprinted in the same magazine for February 1942. I shall read only a few of his words and I shall then ask unanimous consent to include that article also in full.

BILLY MITCHELL POINTED THE WAY

Col. Billy Mitchell wrote 16 years ago:

The United States, knowing about the capacity of modern air forces and being so vulnerable to attack over the land and water, pays little attention to its national defense. It still listens to the advice of its Regular Army and Navy as to what national defense should be. Never has worse advice been given by any department of the Government on broad national questions than that which has been given since the World War by the Army and the Navy to the people and the Congress. They not only are attempting to adhere to a system obsolete even in time of our Civil War, but they have directly and deliberately misrepresented the facts to the Congress and to the people as to what modern national defense is.

Mr. Speaker, what I have said this afternoon is spoken in the most kindly manner. I trust that no one will believe that there are any words of unjust criticism in what I have stated. I am deeply engrossed and intensely interested in this subject. I am of the considered opinion that mistakes in our war program are being made. I do hope that those members on the committee will allow a hearing, so that men like those I have mentioned will be given an opportunity to appear for testimony and questioning.

[From the Aero Digest for February 1942]

AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS

(By Frank A. Tichenor)

"Members of Congress of the United States, you owe it to yourself, to the present generation, yes, even to the coming generation. You have been forewarned as to the condition of the air force. You are in a

place where you may verify all that you have been told. Appoint, if necessary, a committee to investigate, not what took place 7 years ago, but what you have at your very door today. See that appropriations are made sufficiently large to keep the aircraft industry from 'rapidly dwindling and which has now almost reached the vanishing point,' as General Patrick plainly stated.

"This will be real economy. This may mean the saving of thousands of lives. This may even mean the saving of your country from destruction. And remember, that no matter what size the Army and Navy are, they will be helpless without a correspondingly large air force."

The above was not written in 1939, 1940, or 1941. It is quoted directly from an editorial in the January 1925 issue of *Aero Digest*, which was mailed at that time to every Member of Congress. And it was mailed at the request of the late Gen. William Mitchell, then assistant chief of the air services.

And from the same editorial—don't forget the date, January 1925—we quote:

"Common sense demands this course. You, Members of Congress, must face the situation squarely and vote the funds necessary. Other powers are developing their aerial defense according to well-outlined plans while ours is working with rapidly decreasing equipment because of insufficient appropriations for new construction."

Now, let me quote from *Aero Digest's* editorial page 1 year later—January 1926—from General Mitchell's final statement to the court which convicted him:

"My trial before this court martial is the culmination of the efforts of the General Staff of the Army and the General Board of the Navy to deprecate the value of air power and keep it in an auxiliary position which absolutely compromises our whole system of national defense."

"The efforts to keep down our air power were begun as soon as the sound of the cannon had ceased on the western front in 1919. When we sunk the battleships off the Virginia Capes in 1921 and again in 1923 and proved to the world that air power had revolutionized all schemes of national defense, these efforts were redoubled and have continued to this day."

"The truth of every statement which I have made has been proved by good and sufficient evidence before this court, not by men who gain their knowledge of aviation by staying on the ground and having their statements prepared by a numerous staff to bolster up their knowledge first hand in war and in peace."

"I testified that the Air Service had only 19 modern airplanes fit for war and that all others were obsolete and many dangerous. The evidence before this court bears out these facts in their entirety. It has been shown that at present we have only one standard plane in the Service."

"The court has refrained from ruling whether the truth in this case constitutes an absolute defense or not."

"To proceed further with the case would serve no useful purpose."

"I have therefore directed my counsel to entirely close our part of the proceedings without argument."

And in a quote from *Air, Hot and Otherwise*, from the same issue: "Next we are under the necessity of looking at one of the most amazing things in all American history—the Mitchell charges, trial, conviction, and sentence."

"In some degree it grew out of Army and Navy rivalry, in some degree out of fear of a separate air service, in some degree out of the trembling jelly of the timid, bureaucratic mind, in some degree out of sheer ignorance."

"Speaking generally, but emphatically, court-martialing and penalizing enthusiastic, able, expert, and devoted servants of the Nation in the development of our air activi-

ties will not be found to be the first step in the right direction."

"SALUTE TO COLONEL MITCHELL"

"If officers are taught by such events that to tell the truth to a congressional committee is likely to be a course producing such results we scarcely can expect the general run of them to be frank and free in statements if called as witnesses in such circumstances."

"From the beginning our hand has been at salute to Colonel Mitchell, and it is now apparent that an additional reason for this gesture of respect is the undoubted circumstance that he stirred up the waters and produced discussion, investigation, and the recommendations which now lie before the country. He has done more for the cause of aviation than any other man in the whole Nation's history except the Wright brothers."

I now quote from an editorial in the January 1926 issue (p. 23) of *Aero Digest*:

"The officers of the court martial which sentenced the former Chief of Operations of the Army Air Service to 5 years' suspension from rank, command, and pay because he undertook to question the divine right and infallibility of the General Staff, did what was expected of them. Because the court knew that Mitchell had won his case before the people of the United States it did not dare to vote complete dismissal, but hid behind the sham of 'leniency' because of the accused officer's splendid war record."

"The court announced that its verdict was reached 'upon secret written ballot.' That was appropriate; for the military verdict against the man who dared to proclaim that in the next war airplanes would play a more important part than infantry generals' dug-outs was arrived at in secret long before the sessions of the court martial began."

Once again I quote from the January 1926 *Aero Digest*, this time from page 14:

"Should Russia and Japan unite (especially under German leadership), would there be anything to stop them from coming to America by way of Alaska? No more than there was to stop the Germans from going into France by way of Belgium."

"Again, the flight from Japan's possessions to the Philippines is child's play. Once the Japanese were landed in the Philippines how could we get them out? It has been definitely proven that battleships are helpless under air attack unless protected by airplanes."

HEATED DISCUSSION

And, on page 260 of the May 1926 *Aero Digest* there was this report of an incident I witnessed on the Congressional Limited. Two men were in a heated discussion.

"Davis is in favor of a large air force," one had declared. "He has demanded it."

"He's anti-anything in the American air except heat and the General Staff publicity releases—which are very much the same thing," the other had exclaimed before the death grip.

"If I had only been a little quicker I might have saved the fatal clinch of the opponents which caused both to be thrust from the train as it was just about to cross the line out of total abstinence Pennsylvania into prohibition New Jersey (thanks to United States Senator Edwards)."

"For I could have shown them that one was speaking of the Mr. Davis who, as Assistant Secretary of War, spoke at Providence, and the other of that Mr. Davis who is now Secretary of War and as such testified in Washington."

"Our most serious deficiency is in aircraft," said the Assistant Secretary there at Providence. "The situation in the Army Air Service is becoming . . . absolutely critical. . . . In 1922 we had a surplus of 2,125 planes; in 1923 the surplus was 764; in . . . 1926 this shortage will be increased to 1,428. . . . We will find ourselves in the appalling situation . . ."

practically powerless in the case of an emergency."

"This is rendered more serious, because it takes from 10 to 18 months to build a plane, and our airplane industry . . . struggling for existence, could not possibly carry a war load. An industry cannot be created overnight. Aircraft is absolutely essential to modern warfare. If we had to wait . . . we might be defeated before we had begun to fight. . . . Large numbers of our boys would be unnecessarily killed. . . . Our physical isolation, protected by the oceans, is no longer a safe defense. . . . Are we again to shut our eyes in fatuous folly to the lessons of the past and the possibilities of the future? Who pays the cost of such blindness? . . . Every man, woman, and child in the country . . . every taxpayer, every businessman . . . every mother whose boy is sacrificed on the altar of unpreparedness."

"And it is the Secretary speaking now. The Assistant Secretary had had far less politically at stake. . . ."

"The Board found this country is not at present in danger of air attack from any potential enemy of menacing strength. We are 'protected' (now) by the broad ocean on either coast."

"Forgotten are those grim words at Providence."

"It cannot be Secretary of War Dwight Davis speaking. But, nevertheless, it is."

"At Providence Mr. Davis proclaimed in terror that in 1926 we would be defenseless and open to attack."

"May I ask whether the duty of the Assistant Secretary of War is not that of procurement? And if so, why a shortage of planes in 1924-25-26, while he occupied the chairs of Assistant and Secretary of War?"

"In Washington, the same Davis (having been promoted) said: 'I am informed . . . that we are at least equal to any other nation in the world. I would put our personnel higher, but we are at least equal.' If our courageous and patriotic personnel is higher in this defenseless state, it cannot be credited to the weak and flimsy aircraft policy forced on them by the Secretary of War and the General Staff."

ALWAYS AGAINST NEW IDEAS

Again continuing from *Aero Digest*, this time from the November 1927 issue, General Mitchell wrote in his article *What Transatlantic Flights Augur for the Future*:

"Whenever a new undertaking is launched, there are always those who decry its possibilities, usefulness, and value."

"Let things be as they were," they say, "where the relative order of things is well established, and matters go on quietly and smoothly."

"Had this system been followed, we would still be in a state of savagery, chasing each other around with stone axes, and eating raw meat."

"When we first obtained an appropriation for Army aeronautics in this country, we heard the same protest. When I inaugurated the transcontinental flight from New York to San Francisco and return; the flight to Alaska in 1920; the sinking of the battleships in 1921; breaking and obtaining all the world's speed and endurance records for American aviation in 1922; the round-the-world flight; and the second sinking of battleships in 1923, all of which undertakings were entirely and completely successful, we met with the same criticism and obstruction."

"There is one decided lesson which the American people should learn from all that has transpired in American aviation. It is that national aeronautics should be removed entirely from the control of the Army and the Navy, and should be handled by a department of aeronautics, entirely separate from these other services, such as every civilized country in the world has today."

Now, if you need further proof, read what William B. Courtney, aviation editor of *Collier's Weekly*, was told by a member of the German staff:

"We remembered there is always truth in tradition. We looked for a middle way; listened more to your General Mitchell than to General Douhet. Mitchell was the first high officer to see that air power was more than a new auxiliary."

ARNOLD ADVOCATED SEPARATE AIR ARM

And while we are looking over the record, let's see what General Arnold had to say in testimony given to the House Military Affairs Committee in 1935 when the late John J. McSwain, of South Carolina, chairman of the committee, said to him:

"Some of us have heard of you, and I want to ask you to speak out of your own heart and mind your personal conviction with regard to the necessity for independent and increased air power for the defense of America."

In his reply, General Arnold said:

"I can see now where you can hitch a 1,000-mile plane on the operation of the Army or Navy today. I cannot see how, if you are going to use a 3,000-mile bombing plane, you can hitch that on to either the Army or the Navy for all its purposes; and if you get a 5,000-mile plane, then I cannot see how you can hitch its activities on either the Army or Navy."

"And beyond that dreaming a little further, you can have a 8,000-mile plane; then I know well you can't hitch it onto either the Army or Navy activities. It is something beyond the scope of either one."

"In order to get a properly trained and effective department of national defense, you have got to have three arms, land, sea, and air, equally self-supporting."

"I am of the opinion that sometime in the future this thing called a 'department of national defense' is bound to come."

Yes, this is the same General Arnold who is now a lieutenant general and assistant chief of staff.

Last year General Arnold and Col. Ira C. Eaker of the air forces wrote a book called *Winged Warfare* in which they stated:

"Many feel that eventually the defensive air component of the Nation will be given a status coordinate and commensurate with that of the Army and Navy. When that time will come, is not yet clear. It came in some of the other nations of the world when the pressure of war was upon them. We shall be fortunate if our time for that reorganization comes in the relative calm of peace or, at worst, in the preparatory and not in the fighting stage."

Now, let's bring the record up to July 1941 and read a resolution presented to President Roosevelt by a committee of the board of directors (of which the writer has the honor of being chairman) of the National Aeronautic Association—oldest and largest aviation group in the country, having a membership of 18,000; interested only in aviation in national defense; not on the pay roll of either the Army or Navy; not having anything to sell the Government; not worried about promotion and rank; and not afraid of what the powers that be might say or do. Consequently, this committee presented the truth as they found it:

"Resolved—

"The present war has revolutionized methods of warfare and shown the vital necessity for the closest cooperation and unity of command between all fighting forces, with emphasis upon air power."

"The War Department has recently reorganized the Air Corps, creating a semiautonomous air force within the Department. While this reorganization is a step forward, National Aeronautic Association believes it does not offer a solution to the national defense problem. It does not guarantee the fullest cooperation, coordination, and devel-

opment which we believe necessary in the land, sea, and air forces."

"National Aeronautic Association therefore recommends that the President of the United States promptly call upon the proper executive officers and Members of Congress to make a study looking to reorganization of the War and Navy Departments with a view to consolidation into one department of national defense, headed by a Cabinet officer and subdivided into three divisions of land, sea, and air, each headed by an under secretary. Such a single department of national defense, we believe, will best serve the country by insuring the development of an Army and Navy of highest efficiency, together with an invincible air force, all properly coordinated."

We'll bring the record just a little closer, with extracts from a letter received from an English able-bodied seaman, and printed in the January 22, 1942, issue of the *New York Herald Tribune*. This seaman, who has been on active duty in the Mediterranean for 2 years, who has been bombed many times and has had one ship shot from under him, wrote in part:

"The loss of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* isn't calculated to cheer a sailor, and the really acid part of the medicine is that there was no air support. The censor may cavil at my daring to criticize the high command, but then I doubt whether the censor was engaged in the evacuations of Greece and Crete. No air support—the phrase spells annihilation. How many ships and how many lives have had to be sacrificed at this altar of inefficiency. Air support is not enough; there must be air supremacy."

"I know it is an old story, but it is one which should be crooned into the ears of infants; it should be the text for every pulpit; it should be the motto for every schoolboy's composition; it should be stamped on ash trays and beer mugs; it should be 'We must have air supremacy.' Mere plentitude of planes, moreover, is not enough. They must be in the right place at the right time, and they must be of the right type."

"Perhaps one day an explanation will be forthcoming as to exactly why we (and that means America) couldn't have struck first. We could have wiped those troop ships out of existence and hammered their warships to hell and high water. One swift blow shrewdly delivered would have so crushed the Japs that the initiative would have been in our hands."

"I'm sorry if I have bored you, but when you have been dived upon by waves of bombers, averaging about 150 to 200 in each wave, day after day until your ammunition runs out and you are just bordering on insanity, and seen people choked with oil and streaked with wounds, men whose arms have been blown off clinging to bits of wood with their teeth; seen the enemy sweeping down in a machine-gun attack on the men who are struggling in the water and you cannot stop to pick them up because of the bombers—then you will realize that air supremacy becomes a religion."

Members of Congress of the United States, remember that it was air power that caused Poland to surrender unconditionally 26 days after she was invaded.

It was air power that drove the British troops out of Norway 23 days after the Germans first landed.

It was air power that compelled the British Expeditionary Force to clear out of Dunkirk 24 days after Belgium and Holland were attacked.

It was air power that caused the fall of France 13 days later.

It was air power that caused the Yugoslav Army to cave in after 10 days of fighting.

It was air power that took 13 days to conquer Crete.

Bear in mind that it was air power that enabled the unified Royal Air Force fighter planes to hold off the Luftwaffe while the British evacuated some 350,000 soldiers from Dunkirk.

And, it is the same Royal Air Force that has kept England from being invaded and has kept the sea lanes open.

It was air power that on December 7 at Pearl Harbor caused a \$500,000,000 loss in just 1 hour.

It was air attack that sank the *Haruna*, *Prince of Wales*, and *Repulse*, and set up the *Bismarck* for the coup de grace by warships. And, should the British lose Singapore, it will be air power that drives them out; and if Singapore is lost, the British East Indies will go.

Air power combined with sea power can win a war for any country that knows how to use airplanes for transport, attack, and defense. Yes; it will need the help of the Army and Navy, both of which have their place in modern warfare. But it is not the place that the Navy Board and General Staff have planned they should occupy.

And remember that if General MacArthur had 500 bombing planes the 80 transports and the Japanese on board those transports would now be on the bottom of the Pacific and we would be able to give our Allies the aid necessary to hold strategic Singapore and the vital Dutch East Indies.

Mr. Congressman, please read the report on Pearl Harbor submitted to your Chief, by the Presidential Commission, headed by Justice Roberts. Read every word of it. It is as bitter as the gall of a Jap or a Nazi. It is heartbreaking, grim, and sickening. While you are reading it, recall how you at your committee meetings have been misled and misinformed by the selfish, stupid, stiff-necked brass-hat bureaucrats of the Army and the Navy and their hand-picked stooges who testified before you.

These alleged "experts," experts in how to acquire high rank, soft berths, and fat pensions for the balance of their "retired" life.

Meditate a moment on how General Mitchell was sacrificed at the altar of their greed, so that you would not hear the truth.

Read what Frank Hewlett, United Press staff correspondent, sent to the *New York Times* on January 25: "With General MacArthur's Army in the Philippines, January 25—Strong air reinforcements still could turn the tide of battle on Batan Peninsula, military leaders said today."

If the Pearl Harbor needless catastrophe has awakened your august body to the realization that it is air power that will save your country from destruction at the hands of the barbarians, then the many thousand lives sacrificed at Honolulu will not have been in vain.

(General Mitchell's keen foresight and straightforward analysis of the dangers of unpreparedness are vividly demonstrated by the following article published in the July 1926 issue of *Aero Digest*. Although written almost 16 years ago, the article is reprinted herewith because it is as timely as if it were written today. Had his warnings been heeded by Congress, the General Staff and the Naval Board, the Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor would not have suffered a \$500,000,000 loss in less than 1 hour.)

AWAKE, AMERICA!

(A warning call for action written 16 years ago especially for *Aero Digest* by the late Col. William L. Mitchell, former Assistant Chief of the Army Air Service)

It must be the policy of every government to guarantee to its people a reasonable degree of security, prosperity, and happiness.

The basis on which such a policy must be built is constitutional national government and its application to conditions that confront the nation.

These conditions never remain entirely the same for long periods. They change from time to time.

National defense is an important adjunct of national policy which is called into use when other means of adjusting international disputes have failed.

It is one concrete proposition for the whole country. It is not a monopoly exercised by any class, section, or division of the people.

Air forces, armies, and navies are merely agencies of the people to carry out their will where national physical defense is required.

In international war, surface navies are practically useless. The submarine is now the main instrument of maritime warfare.

Air power has taken its place as the dominant instrument in international war. It can fly straight through the air to the vital centers of the opposing state, destroy them and render the country losing control of the air in a defenseless state.

The relative value of the principal active elements of national defense, on a basis of 100, is about 20 for a navy, 30 for an army, and 50 for air power, or the combined value of both a navy and an army.

COURTING DISASTER

Today a country weak in air power courts disaster.

Today a country without a single department of national defense to coordinate its system of protection cannot survive in a modern war.

The United States is the only civilized country which has not coordinated its national defense elements under a single direction, and which still trusts to an army and navy alone to protect it.

The United States, knowing about the capacity of modern air forces and being so vulnerable to attack over the land and the water, pays little attention to its national defense. It still listens to the advice of its Regular Army and Navy as to what national defense should be. Never has worse advice been given by any departments of the Government on broad national questions than that which has been given since the World War by the Army and Navy to our people and Congress. They not only are attempting to adhere to a system obsolete even in the time of our Civil War, but they have directly and deliberately misrepresented facts to the Congress and the people as to what modern national defense is.

The valor of ignorance pervades the bureaus of the Army and Navy in Washington from top to bottom. Not only are huge sums of money being spent uselessly but the people are led into a false feeling that something is being done to protect them, whereas practically nothing is.

We will not have national defense in this country until this matter is taken out of the hands of the Regular Army and Navy, who have established and maintain an interlocking directorate to suppress all modern means of defense. They maintain lobbies in Washington to influence the President and Congress. They have propaganda agencies which carry on a campaign of misrepresentation as to modern defense conditions all over the country. They call on industries that sell them equipment to assist them politically and obtain political support from the communities in which their organizations, posts, and stations are maintained.

This system must be changed; it has become a national cancer.

We must have a single department of national defense with subheads for the air, land, water, and munitions. We must have a single directing head and a single staff to handle all major defense questions.

Until this is done we shall continue to lean on a broken reed, and should the call come to defend this great country we shall find ourselves even more defenseless than we were at the beginning of the Civil War or the World War.

Intelligent public opinion reflected in laws enacted by Congress is the only remedy.

I include also my address from the American Forum of the Air, Sunday, October 19, 1941, on the subject Should America Have a Separate Air Force? Speaking also in the affirmative was Col. Harold E. Hartney, aviation authority and commander of the First Pursuit Group in the World War:

Mr. Granik, ladies, and gentlemen, the building of an invincible air power in this country is in response to a popular demand evident years before the present programs for aircraft production and pilot training were even conceived and executed.

On the question of giving our defense air forces an independent status for still faster and more efficient development, the American public again has taken the initiative. According to a recent Gallup poll, 49 percent of those who were interviewed favor a separate air force, 27 percent are undecided, and only 24 percent are opposed.

Aviation authorities, particularly men who flew in the last war, overwhelmingly favor this action.

Let it be understood that by advocating a separate air force we do not mean that we have lack of confidence in the ability of the Army or of the Navy. Their commanders are well able to organize the operations on land and sea which have been their traditional functions.

Neither should it be thought that anyone wants to strip the Army and Navy of their own air arms necessary for observation and for the protection of their forces. But the main job of air defense, to be carried out by bombers and fast fighting ships on missions which are a function of air power, has become a new branch of warfare which can best be handled by officers trained for air command.

This is proved from the experiences of England and Germany. There are those who say that America should apply this lesson ultimately, but that it is not timely to change in the face of an emergency. This is the most powerful argument for immediate change, so that we will be organized for the highest possible effectiveness before we are faced with a military crisis.

We have seen our air defenses not only fail to develop but actually retrogress for years after the last World War. Innovations such as the airplane armor, self-sealing gas tanks, cannon, and .50-caliber machine guns, which were beginning to be used in France, were forgotten for years and had to be redeveloped in our present program. We have seen men of vision, like Gen. Billy Mitchell, discredited and persecuted for being brave enough to tell the people what we now know is the truth. [Applause.]

While there has been a marked progress in recent months, conflicts between the Army and Navy on important matters, such as aircraft priorities, and the slowness to accept new ideas are all too evident. Although it has been known that Germany and Russia have trained thousands of glider pilots, it was not until the Battle of Crete that our Army began to recognize the need for troop-carrying gliders. Now our Army has two gliders. Hitler has thousands. The value of light planes has recently been demonstrated in maneuvers in Louisiana, yet the Army, seemingly, has made no move to utilize this experience.

Only a few days ago the Army created a system of air-support commands for closer cooperation between aircraft and ground forces, which most of us assumed had been in effect years ago. This change, on top of the earlier reshuffling in the semblance of an autonomous air force, makes it apparent that the officials in Washington are disposed to make concessions to the separate air-force idea and to the principle of coordination which goes with it.

Why not go the whole way now? Modern warfare is a job of large-scale organization, which demands the creation of a single department of national defense, with the branches of air, sea, and land under a unified command which will insure their complete teamwork and effectiveness against the kind of emergency that America soon may face.

Another address is included which I made on the American Forum of the Air, Sunday, January 11, 1942, on the subject Is Air Power Dominant in Modern Warfare. Speaking also on the affirmative side was Maj. Alexander de Seversky, noted aviator and plane designer:

Whatever doubts there may have been as to the dominance of air power in modern warfare have been blasted away in the rain of bombs on Pearl Harbor and on the helpless cities of the Philippines.

For 20 years the deadly effectiveness of military aviation has been foreseen by a small group of men who were fighting pilots in the last World War.

Their predictions were confirmed by the failure of the ground forces in Poland and the Low Countries against Hitler's dive bombers and double-checked when the British Navy with all its might was unable to prevent the occupation of Norway.

The battle of Crete will stand as a military classic of all time as the first major operation in which aviation was the whole show with glider and parachute troops overwhelming the ground forces while bombers knocked out a powerful surface fleet.

These were the plain lessons of air power as a weapon of defense while Russia and the Royal Air Force bravely demonstrated that the only defense is stronger air power.

Not fully cognizant of this truth until our own men became the victims of Japan's treacherous attack, America has learned the hard way. But the United States has learned.

It is clearly significant that the vast expenditures budgeted for our victory program in the year to come place greatest emphasis on airplanes and antiaircraft guns, while old-style surface warships are conspicuously absent.

The words of the President burn themselves into our consciousness when he said to Congress and to the world in his message on January 6: that "we must increase our production rate of airplanes so rapidly that in this year, 1942, we shall produce 60,000 planes, 10,000 more than the goal set for us a year and a half ago. This includes 45,000 combat planes—bombers, dive bombers, pursuit planes. The rate of increase will be continued so that the next year, 1943, we shall produce 125,000 airplanes, including 100,000 combat planes."

But there is more to be done. A few believers in air power who, with a bravery equal to that which they displayed over the battlefields, have fought for many years against public apathy and the bitterest criticism and ridicule to accomplish two purposes—first, to tell the country what air power means and second, to effectively organize this force.

On the one point they were too terribly accurate in their predictions. We would be foolhardy if we failed to heed their further warnings as to how American air power can best be organized to win this war. These patriotic men urge, as they have urged for discouraging years, that America's air forces be given their own command under aviation leaders. When you and I walk the streets of an American city today, we see our defenders in the uniforms of the Army and Navy. Let our airmen too have their own uniforms to proclaim to the enemies of civilization not only that air power but that American air power is supreme in the world today.

January 21, 1938, during House debate, I said:

"The day of battleships is going fast. There will be battles some day in which bombers will be used to completely wipe out battleships."

March 15, 1938, I stated:

"We must realize that there are changes taking place in the prosecution of war."

March 17, 1938, I reiterated:

"The scene of conflict has shifted from the land and sea into the air."

Again and again we have been thwarted. We must continue, however, to believe with the poet:

"I call no fight a losing fight

If, fighting, I have gained some straight new strength;

If, fighting, I turned ever toward the light, which ultimately must prevail."

The following article appeared in the New York Times of Wednesday, January 28, 1942:

TRENCHARD, CHIEF OF R. A. F., WARNS UNITED STATES TO IGNORE ARMY AND NAVY OPPOSITIONS OF A UNITED AIR FORCE—MARSHAL URGES UNITED STATES NOT TO BE DELUDED BY INEXPERT CRITICS WHOSE OBJECTIONS ALSO ARE RESULT OF BIAS AGAINST FLIERS—DENIES YARNELL'S CHARGES THAT HIS MEN FAILED OFF NORWAY, THAT ONE TORPEDOED BRITISH CRUISER IN "BISMARCK" BATTLE

(By Viscount Trenchard, Marshal of the Royal Air Force)

LONDON, January 27.—Far be it from me to add to the controversy that seems always to rage when any matters of how to use air power are debated. I cannot help remembering what a great general remarked to me in the last war about these controversies:

"Why do you deplore the fight over air between the services? As long as there is air there will always be an air crisis due to the extraordinary speed and range of aircraft."

In recent months a great deal has been written in the American press and elsewhere to prove that the British system of an autonomous air force is a disastrous failure, that each and every reverse that has befallen British arms from Norway to Crete has been due to the existence of the third service and that even our successes such as the sinking of the *Bismarck* and the improvement in the battle of the Atlantic and in the battle of Britain were for some mystical reason in spite of and not due to our organization.

The moral is drawn that the present system in the United States, where there are three or four separate air forces, should be perpetuated in the United States and extended to the British Empire.

I do not presume to suggest to the United States how their forces should be organized. I do not profess to be an expert on Western Hemisphere defense and would not presume to offer advice on that subject to those whose business it is further, perhaps, than to express the hope that they will not permit themselves to be deluded by inexpert and biased criticism into making wrong judgments on premises fantastically incorrect.

The first point to remember as a background to all consideration of the lessons of this war up to date is that we started the war in a shocking condition of weakness. For years we had been spending annually about eight times as much on the older services as we spent on the Air Force.

AIR FORCE DEEDS MINIMIZED

The lessons and portents of the last war were not generally understood, and after that war most responsible officers in the Navy and Army minimized the accomplishments of the air forces in the war and failed to foresee what should have been plain for all to see, the potentialities of air power 20 years ahead.

Fifteen years later we failed to profit by the unmistakable warnings we received in 1934, or even in 1938, to take our aircraft

production seriously in hand, and no one can look back today on the air situation in September 1939 without a shudder at our sheer audacity in going to war at all with the air force and the aircraft industry in the state they were in at that time.

Even 20 months later, at the time of Crete, we had still had to concentrate our resources on providing for the vital needs of defense at home and in the Atlantic to an extent that may be measured by the fact that at the time of Crete we had barely 50 serviceable fighters in the Middle East command, and a few obsolescent American fighters at Singapore.

Fifteen years ago I, as Chief of the Air Staff, was advocating that Malaya should be made a great air base and that our limited allotment of money should be spent on bombers and torpedo aircraft instead of on the huge guns that are there now.

The situation is very different today. But the significant fact is that in only two major operations have we had anything approaching the necessary air strength, namely, the battle of Britain and the recent operations in Libya. And we were only able to secure that strength by a ruthless adherence to the one great principle of air warfare, the principle that in itself not only justifies but imperatively demands a single autonomous air force, the principle of concentration of the greatest available force on the task that is decisive at the time.

The second point to remember, arising directly out of the first, is that the democracies cannot do in peace or even always in war all the things that are strategically desirable, a condition which, while it will be a strength in the long run, is often temporarily a terrible strategic handicap.

STATESMAN IS RESPONSIBLE

In a democracy, because it is a democracy, the fighting man is the servant of the statesman and strategy is profoundly affected by internal and international politics. The military chiefs are the advisers on military policy and the executives through which that policy, once decided, is put into effect. The responsibility is with the statesman who has to justify his actions and maintain his position in a legally constituted representative assembly, representative of the people, whose knowledge of military matters is non-existent and whose judgment is frequently wrong, based as it must be in war on a necessarily incomplete possession of the facts.

It is therefore all the more important that advice on the application of air power should be the responsibility of a single head of a centralized service, working as the chief of an expert staff who have made a life study of air power and its problems and that the decisions of the political authority, the Prime Minister, and the War Cabinet, should be capable of being translated into action with that promptitude and administrative efficiency which would be impossible under divided control.

The principle of concentration on the decisive point is indeed the essence of air power. No serious exponent of air power or of the system of a third service claims that war can be won solely by air forces. No one weapon, no single service, no specialized military method, can win any war. But the misuse or failure to take advantage of any one military method may well lose a war and can very easily prolong it disastrously.

The art of war is to know how to weld all tactics into one whole, when to put the emphasis on one or another, how much of the nation's resources to allot to each, and, as far as air power is concerned, to take full advantage of its flexibility to concentrate it in adequate strength at the place and on the task which is of decisive importance at the time.

We cannot be stronger than the enemy everywhere all the time. If we could be, it would cease to be relevant because the war would be won. So we must use our air re-

sources flexibly as our major national strategy demands at the time, as the Germans do. We can only do that if we have a single autonomous air service as the Germans have, based by Goering's own admission on our model.

SUPERIOR GERMAN CONTROL

Where their organization is superior to ours is, first, in their centralized high direction, which controls and coordinates the effort of all three services and, secondly, in the fact that they have ruthlessly discarded outworn naval and military traditions, have allotted to air power its proper share in their plans, and have remolded their naval and military technique to suit the conditions of the air age.

In this latter respect we have much to learn from them. Armies and fleets are still expected, or have until very recently been expected, to do things they are quite unable to do, such as fight a land war without air superiority or control narrow waters which are dominated by hostile air power.

Conversely, it is not unknown for air forces to be expected to perform tasks for which they are quite unfitted, or at least can only perform by a quite disproportionate expenditure of effort, manpower and material, and then not so effectively as the land or sea forces whose proper tasks they are.

If for major strategic reasons we cannot concentrate adequate air power in any place or on any task, then the operations of our naval and land forces must be adjusted accordingly. It may, for political reasons, be considered necessary to fight on land or at sea without adequate air support. We had to in Norway, and we had to in Greece and Crete, because there were not the air forces available, nor were there adequate airdromes if they had been.

Admiral Yarnell, who in a recent article in Collier's magazine makes the extraordinary assumption that the loss of Crete was due to some arbitrary and one-sided decision on the part of the Royal Air Force to withdraw air support, is not alone in his failure to understand the profound influence of geographic conditions on the exercise of air power.

He would not suggest, for instance, that the United States Fleet should be told to operate in Japanese waters without a base in the Far East or a reasonably secure line of supply for its tankers and ammunition ships. Yet an air force without bases and without a secure system of supply for fuel, bombs, and spare parts is just as helpless as that fleet would be. And that handicap cannot be offset by the use of long-range aircraft, because the short-range fighter will always outfight the long-range aircraft of any class.

WEAKNESS SEEN IN DIVISION

But if we have to fight without adequate air support we must do so with our eyes open and we must not hope to be able to alleviate the results of a military set-back in Greece or a naval disaster in the Gulf of Siam by breaking up the Air Force and putting bits of it under the Army and Navy and thus making sure that we shall have neither adequate air strength anywhere nor the expert single advice as to how to use what we have.

Our basic strategic policy cannot fluctuate with every wind that blows because on our strategic policy depends our production policy and on our production policy depends our capacity to have aircraft of the right types in the right numbers and in the right place when we want them. Thus we must concentrate on the vital things first and shape accordingly our international policy and that part of our military policy that is within our control. And this involves taking chances somewhere. We have built up our fighter strength in the United Kingdom and home waters to an adequate level. We have at last had something like adequate air strength in the present operations in the Middle East, where we had to take danger-

ous chances until and after Italy came into the war, just as we had to take chances in the Far East before Japan came into the war in order to build up adequate allied air strength in what were then and still are in large measure the decisive theaters, the Mediterranean, and Russia. We concentrated resources in personnel and bomber type aircraft on building up the coastal command to a point at which it was somewhere near adequate at the end of 1941 for its tasks in conjunction with the Navy in keeping the menace in the Atlantic and in home waters within measurable limits.

We did this at the expense of the bomber command. Yet air power cannot play its part in helping us win the war unless we maintain unwaveringly the policy of the offensive and concentrate steadily and consistently on building up a bomber force which, while always available if required for defensive operations in support of the other services, has suitable aircraft and suitably trained crews in adequate numbers to sustain the offensive against our primary enemy to wear down German resistance from within and play a major part in creating that situation without which no allied army can ever hope to force its way into Germany.

Such a bomber force can never be built up or effectively employed except on a basis of centralized control, administration, and training.

ADEQUATE AIR COVER VITAL

No major military or naval operation can hope to succeed in these days without adequate cover against enemy air action and effective support by our own air striking force. That surely is a lesson of this war which requires no eloquence to emphasize.

A fleet at sea, operating beyond the range of shore-based air support, must take its own air support with it in the form of shipborne aircraft and these may be and in the British system are part of the fleet. Shipborne fighters, however, are not always available and the loss of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* has proved what the air staff have constantly urged in the past, that when neither ship-borne nor shore-based fighter cover can be afforded heavy ships cannot venture safely within the effective range of shore-based air striking forces.

But it hardly needed Pearl Harbor to prove that the air defense of a fleet base or of an area of land operations is not a naval or an Army function.

There is a natural tendency for every subordinate military or naval commander to clamor for close air protection by squadrons under his own command. That tendency, unless rigidly resisted, can only end in disaster.

Their speed in miles per minute and their range in terms of hundreds, nay, even thousands, of miles cannot possibly be effectively exercised by men whose vision is limited to the horizon as seen from the seat of a motorcar and whose whole training and instinct is to regard a hundred miles as a day's journey.

There are no frontiers, no high-water marks in the air. And the first essential qualification of the airman is to be an airman, to be able to operate his aircraft or command his squadron or wing or group efficiently, whatever the objectives he may be required to attack or whatever the areas he may be called upon to defend.

SPECIALIZATION IS NONSENSE

There is a great deal of egregious nonsense talked about the need for specialized training for air operations in support of armies and navies. The uninitiated would almost be led to believe that it is necessary to breed a special type of man to recognize a ship at sea or an enemy tank in the desert.

Some special training is obviously necessary, but it is surely equally obvious that after the first few months of a war the long and intimate experience and highly special-

ized training that is so often claimed as essential for effective air support of land or sea forces simply is not available. Replacements would have to come, as they do now, from keen young volunteers from civil life with no specialized naval or military knowledge.

The Royal Air Force crews of the coastal command, though they persistently decline to call their bedroom a cabin or a service motorcar a liberty boat, have given and are giving service that could not be excelled by the smartest sublieutenant who ever passed top out of Dartmouth.

General Auchinleck's frequently reiterated praise of the air support and cooperation in this Libyan campaign means only that at last we have been able to undertake a land campaign possessed of sufficient air forces to ensure that air supremacy without which no land campaign can succeed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the conclusion of the legislative program and other special orders I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a short poem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief excerpt from the People's Lobby Bulletin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LET THE PRESIDENT DECIDE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it plain that I have no desire to question the sincerity of the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, my personal friend [Mr. RANDOLPH]. I do not agree with the gentleman. I have

read considerable on the subject, and have had some information concerning experiences in this war, but I am not going to relate that, as it might be considered criticism or be beneficial to our enemies.

I confess that I do not know enough about military and naval warfare to come to a conclusion upon such an important subject.

I know that the President of the United States today has the power, if he desires to use it, to do everything that the gentleman from West Virginia desires done. I trust the President to do what he thinks best, based upon experience and the advice of the generals and admirals upon whom he must rely.

I have never knowingly made a misleading statement on this floor, and I never will to achieve an objective, but I will say this much, and I know what I am talking about—far more has been done relative to unified operations than the gentleman ever dreamed of. That is as far as I will go. So do not be alarmed; you will have unity of command whenever and wherever it is justified.

This question has been under discussion for years. There was and is a difference of opinion, not with our Army and Navy, but civilians, as to what is best for this Nation.

I am going to relate a little experience I had which brought about a discussion for months. It so happens I was off the Virginia Capes shortly after the World War when bombers from Langley Field came out to attack what was called an unsinkable battleship that was allocated to this country after the war to be used for scientific purposes. The agreement was to destroy it before a certain date. We were on the transport *Henderson*.

This battleship was at anchor and, of course, unprotected. Now I tell you what I know, not what I heard, because I personally witnessed the destruction of the ship. It was constructed under the supervision of the highest ranking officer in the German Navy, had several armored decks, and many airtight compartments. Thus it was described as an unsinkable battleship.

The first day the bombers dropped sandbags. Then they dropped hundred-pound bombs, then 200-pound bombs, always increasing the size of the bombs. Finally six bombers came from Langley Field, and their instructions were to make three hits. They had 2,000-pound bombs. The bombs must have cost plenty of money. They were in what we were told was battle formation, a half-mile or a mile behind the other.

A board of officers would visit the ship after each attack, and little damage had been done by the small bombs.

The bombers had orders to try and drop their bombs alongside of the ship rather than make a direct hit. As I understood it, they felt a hit alongside of the ship would spring the plates.

I might say at this point we had not advanced in aviation very rapidly. Every 5 miles from the field to the ship would be found a destroyer so the bombers would know the course and also for safety.

The first bomb that was dropped fell astern of the ship, about 100 yards—at least it so appeared from where we were; the second bomb dropped right alongside the bow of the ship, on the starboard side; the third bomb hit the stern of the ship and the fourth bomb hit on the portside of the ship at the bow. By that time the ship was listing, finally turned over, bottom up, and went down, stern first. By my watch, that great 40,000-ton piece of steel went below the water in 19½ minutes after the first bomb was dropped.

Picture if you will that great mass of steel so put together that it was declared to be unsinkable being sent to the bottom of the ocean in 19½ minutes.

It was one of the most dramatic scenes I had ever witnessed in my life. You could have heard a pin drop on board that transport. Later the Army was jubilant. The Navy was depressed. I was the guest of the then Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Coontz, who came from my State. A few minutes before, he had told me, "We will show you how to sink that ship. Those bombers cannot sink it. When they get through, I will send the battleship *Pennsylvania* off 5 miles, and we will sink it, because we must sink it today."

The Navy immediately had an alibi. The officers said it was all offensive and no defense. In any event newspaper article after newspaper article and magazine article after magazine article appeared discussing the sinking of that battleship.

Some predicted the death of the battleship. Others classed the battleship as obsolete. Some demanded a department of national defense with a secretary for war, a secretary for navy, and a secretary for air. Others urged a department of air. The discussion went on for months.

Following this I was introduced to General Billy Mitchell by our late Speaker, Mr. Joe Byrns. It was at a luncheon Mr. Byrns gave, only three of us being present and we had a discussion lasting 2 hours. Therefore I think I know a little about General Mitchell's views. Likewise I have heard considerable testimony from various sources about a department of national defense.

This question was brought to a head in 1932 when the Democrats had a very small majority in this House and considered an economy bill. I was a member of that committee. Judge McDuffie was chairman. Through some maneuvering in the committee two separate provisions were placed in the bill by the votes of Members of both parties. The Republicans wanted a certain matter voted on; some of the Democrats wanted a provision for a department of national defense. Through the medium of a little logrolling both suggestions were placed in the bill.

On the question of a Department of National Defense we had a roll call. A former Member of the House who served as a major general in the Army and who was retired, General Martin, of Oregon, moved to strike the provision from the bill. There were no politics in the vote, Democrats and Republicans alike voting for and against the proposal. Two hun-

dred and ten Members voted against a Department of National Defense and 187 for it.

I went along with the committee recommendation and voted for it. It was defeated. I admit it was not considered on its merits, as no hearings were held by the committee. The War and Navy Departments opposed it. I found out later that vote was forced for a purpose. It should never have been advanced. I made a mistake in supporting it.

Glance over that vote and you will find men who knew something about our Army and Navy voting against a Department of National Defense, chairmen and members of the committees handling our naval and military legislation.

At one time the Committee on Expenditures held hearings on this subject, and I am confident that when I left the chairmanship of that committee and assumed the chairmanship of another committee I left in the committee room several hundred copies of that hearing. I think the gentleman from West Virginia can get one if he desires.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think no Member of this House should be accused of unjustly leveling criticism at the War Department because he happens to believe that a plan of organization and administration is preferable to that which has existed or even exists today. There are Members on the floor now who sat this morning with the House Committee on Roads when we discussed a proposal to build a 1,500-mile highway into Alaska. It is reported for the record that as late as April 1941 the War Department was against the building of that highway, saying that it had no military value. Today the War Department is ready to have its representatives appear before the committee and state that they were wrong. I am certain that it is absolutely inopportune to charge any Member who disagrees with the present set-up. Since Pearl Harbor the President did not hesitate to have Justice Roberts lead a group in ferreting out the reasons for our showing there. We cannot stand the shock of too many Pearl Harbors.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from West Virginia can be assured the gentleman from Missouri will never criticize him for expressing his views as I know how sincere he is. I have admired his independence ever since he became a Member of this body and congratulate his constituents upon having such a representative. The fact that I disagree with him now by no means should be taken as a criticism, nor have I said a word in this discussion that could be justified as criticism other than of his view. The gentleman from West Virginia and I have been close personal friends for years. He has not always agreed with me but that never interfered with our friendship. The gentleman is entitled to express his views as I have mine.

The appearance of one of our Members at this time gives me another thought. It so happens that the gentleman who has just come into the

Chamber, the gentlewoman from Montana [Miss RANKIN], has been urging this very legislation before the Committee on Expenditures for many years. Prior to her return to the House, after an absence of many years, Miss RANKIN had Members of the House introduce such bills. Among them was one introduced by my good friend Mr. Jerry Boileau, of Wisconsin. Mr. Boileau for years tried to get some action on the bill, but the committee was against it. The War and Navy Departments were opposed to it.

Miss RANKIN traveled throughout the country making speeches in favor of the bill. She made a very interesting address in my own city as a result of which I had considerable work assailing her views in answer to letters I received. I did not mind that. Freedom of expression is one thing I will fight for so long as the speaker does not try to undermine our Constitution. I merely cite this to show you this is no new question.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this subject is of great importance and especially at a time when the country is at war. In view of this we should proceed with caution. The only testimony you would be satisfied with would be the testimony of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff and the head of the Air Corps. That is the only testimony you would be satisfied with. Can we afford at a time like this to take those gentlemen from their desks, bring them down to sit day after day with a committee of this House to determine a question of such great importance, especially when, by unanimous vote, the Senate Military Affairs Committee, within the last 2 weeks, decided it would not hold hearings on the subject?

Mr. Speaker, there is no man living who wants to win this war and win it in a hurry more than does the President of the United States. He has the power to do just exactly what the bills provide. If that be so, I say let good enough alone; leave it to the President of the United States, and I am sure if he finds in the end he has made a mistake by not providing for a Department of National Defense or a separate Air Corps he will be the first man to admit it and he will act accordingly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

OFF-STREET PARKING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1945) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, operate, and regulate public off-street parking facilities, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has this bill been acted on by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I may say in answer to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader that this measure has been considered by the House Committee on the District of Columbia and has been reported to the House by a unanimous vote. The bill has also unanimously passed the Senate of the United States.

The measure directs its language to off-street parking facilities in the District of Columbia. As the gentleman and our colleagues on the floor well know, the problem of the congestion of traffic and available space for the parking of automobiles within the District of Columbia is one of growing proportions. This is just a part of a plan of legislative approach to aid in properly handling this trouble.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Just what does the bill do?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The measure provides for the acquisition, the creation, and the operation under public regulation of public off-street parking facilities in the District of Columbia. We believe that by so doing there would be a facilitation of the free circulation of traffic in and through the District.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much money is involved?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The measure authorizes the use of the highway fund of the District in order to carry out the provisions of the act for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1942. Thereafter the Commissioners are authorized and directed to include in their annual estimates such amounts as may be required from said highway fund and the fund created by this act for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Commissioners are agreeable to this measure?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They are unanimous and enthusiastic in their support of the measure. It has been recommended by the Commissioner of Highways of the District of Columbia, Captain Whitehurst, and also the director of vehicles, Mr. Van Duzer.

Mr. JONKMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this bill embrace in its purview the preventing of parking on the streets?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; it does not; but it is felt that this bill will alleviate the problem of parking on the streets to a great degree. There have been estimates before the committee in the hearings that it may take as much as 18 to 20 percent of the cars now parking on the streets off the streets.

Mr. JONKMAN. This bill does not relate to the ordinances preventing parking on the streets in certain districts?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; that remains as is.

Mr. COSTELLO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain whether this bill would also include the taking over of some of the triangles that are operated as parks by the National Park Service throughout the

District, and utilizing them for parking facilities?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It would provide for the acquisition and improvement of other necessary parking facilities, which would include the suggestion the gentleman has made.

Mr. COSTELLO. The thought I have in mind is that there is opposite the Navy Department Building a tremendous triangle of ground that is nothing but a plot of grass. Certainly for the duration of the war that ground could easily be used for parking. I believe there are any number of similar triangles that are not particularly scenic, having no trees on them, that could very well be utilized for that purpose. This might obviate the purchase of a large number of properties that would be of no value afterward.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman from California. May I say that the provisions of the bill call for the creation of a parking agency to consist of seven members, a representative from the Federal Works Agency, a representative of the National Park Service, a representative of the Department of Vehicles and Traffic of the District, and four other members, each of whom must have been a resident of the District for 3 years; so we do feel that the make-up of this agency will be such as to bring to its attention the possibility of the utilization of the space to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. COSTELLO. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is on the other side of the railroad track, the wrong side, if you please, between the great Capitol of the United States and the beautiful grounds of the Army War College, an area that is being overlooked and neglected by the Federal Government. I distinctly recall that a recent issue of one of our daily papers carried a full-page black-out of that region, showing where our men in uniform are prohibited from going. I am wondering why it would not be a good proposition to go into that area and reclaim it, and make a parking lot of part of it as a starter for the improvement of this ground between the Capitol of the United States and the beautiful Army War College which, by the way, seems to be on the wrong side of the railroad tracks so far as receiving any attention from the powers-that-be in the Department is concerned.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman. I am sure his suggestion will be looked on very carefully by the agency which will set up parking facilities within the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared that the free circulation of traffic of all kinds through the highways of the District is necessary to the health, safety, and general welfare of the public, whether residing in said District, or traveling to, through, or from said District in the course of lawful pursuits; that in recent years the greatly in-

creased use by the public of motor vehicles of all kinds has caused serious traffic congestion on the highways of the District; that the parking of motor vehicles on the highways of the District has contributed to this congestion to such an extent as to interfere seriously with the primary use of such highways for the movement of traffic; that such parking prevents the free circulation of traffic in, through, and from said District, impedes rapid and effective fighting of fires and the disposition of police forces in the District, threatens irreparable loss in valuations of property in the District, which can no longer be readily reached by vehicular traffic, and endangers the health, safety, and welfare of the general public; that this parking nuisance can be reduced by providing sufficient off-street parking facilities conveniently located in the several residential, commercial, industrial, and governmental areas of the District; that adequate off-street parking facilities have not been provided by private enterprise; that it may be necessary to supplement private parking spaces by off-street parking facilities provided by public undertaking; and that the enactment of this act, as well as the use of land for the purposes set forth in this act, is hereby declared to be a public necessity.

SEC. 2. That, when used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise—

The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

The term "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The term "agency" means the motor vehicle parking agency created in section 4 of this act.

The term "parking facilities" means one or more public off-street parking areas for motor vehicles, including necessary structures.

SEC. 3. The Commissioners, within the limits of appropriations by Congress therefor, are authorized to exercise all powers necessary and convenient to carry out the purposes of this act, the said purposes being hereby declared to be the acquisition, creation, and operation, in any manner hereinafter provided, under public regulations, of public off-street parking facilities in the District as a necessary incident to insuring in the public interest the free circulation of traffic in and through said District. Such powers shall include, but shall not be limited to, the powers hereinafter enumerated:

(a) The power to acquire any property, real or personal, or any interest therein, by purchase, lease, gift, bequest, devise, or grant, or by condemnation under the provisions of sections 483 to 491, inclusive, of chapter XV, as amended, of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1265-1266), in any area of the District as to which the agency shall have made a determination that public parking facilities are necessary or expedient. Before acquiring any area for parking facilities the Commissioners shall request the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for its recommendations, and it shall be the duty of said Commission to report thereon within 30 days of such request.

(b) The power to undertake, by contract or otherwise, the clearance and improvement of any such property as well as the construction, establishment, reconstruction, alteration, repair, maintenance, and operation thereon of parking facilities; to contract, by lease or otherwise, with competitive bidding, with any individual, firm, association, or corporation, private or public, for the operation of any parking facilities for such period, not exceeding 5 years, as the Commissioners shall determine, and to terminate, without prior notice, any contract in the event of any failure or omission of any party thereto to observe or enforce the rules or schedules of rates made under authority of paragraph (d) of this section.

(c) The power to sell, exchange, transfer, or assign any property, real or personal, or any interest therein, acquired under authority of this act, whether or not improved: *Provided*, That such action shall be in accordance with the general law covering the disposal of such property by the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the agency shall have first determined such property to be no longer necessary for the purposes of this act.

(d) The power to establish and from time to time to revise, with or without public hearings, uniform schedules of rates to be charged for use of space in each such parking facility; to provide rate differentials between said parking facilities for such reasons as the amount of space occupied, the location of the facility, and other reasonable differences; and to prescribe and promulgate such rules and regulations for the carrying out of the provisions of this act as may be necessary to keep said parking facilities subject at all times to public regulation, and to insure the maintenance and operation of such parking facilities in a clean and orderly manner and in such a manner as to provide efficient and adequate service to the public. The rates to be charged for parking of motor vehicles within said parking facilities shall be fixed at the lowest possible rates, consistent with the achievement of the purposes of this act, that will defray the cost of maintaining, operating, and administering the parking facilities; liquidate within such time as the Commissioners shall determine the cost of acquiring and improving the required property for parking-facility purposes; and provide for the acquisition and improvement of other necessary parking facilities, but without any purpose of obtaining for the District any profit or surplus revenue from the operation of said parking facilities. There shall be no discrimination in rates or privileges among the members of the public using said parking facilities.

(e) The power to secure and install mechanical parking meters or parking devices on the streets, avenues, roads, highways, and other public spaces in the District under the jurisdiction and control of the said Commissioners, in addition to those mechanical parking meters and devices installed pursuant to the authority conferred on the said Commissioners by section 11 of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1939, approved April 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 192), such meters or devices to be located at such points as the Commissioners may determine, and the said Commissioners are authorized and empowered to make and enforce rules and regulations for the control of parking of vehicles on such streets, avenues, roads, highways, and other public spaces, and as an aid to such regulation and control of the parking of vehicles the Commissioners may prescribe fees for the parking of vehicles where meters or devices are installed.

SEC. 4. There is hereby created a motor-vehicle parking agency consisting of seven members, namely, a representative of the Federal Works Agency, to be designated by the Administrator thereof; a representative of the National Park Service, to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior; a representative of the Department of Vehicles and Traffic of the District, to be designated by the Commissioners; and four other members, each of whom shall have been a bona fide resident of the District for at least 3 years immediately preceding his appointment, to be appointed by the Commissioners, without regard to race or creed. The Secretary of the Interior, the Federal Works Administrator, and the Commissioners may from time to time, in their discretion, change their respective designates in office, and they shall name new designates to fill any vacancies caused by the death, resignation, or other inability to serve of their respective designates in office. The terms of the other four members of the agency shall be 4 years each, except that in the case of

the initial appointments one shall be for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, and one for a term of 3 years. In the case of any vacancy in the position of the members appointed for definite terms the same shall be filled for the remainder of the term. The said agency shall perform the duties imposed upon it by this act and such other duties as the Commissioners may assign to it. The Commissioners are authorized to delegate to the agency any or all of the powers vested in the said Commissioners by this act, except the powers set forth in paragraphs lettered (a) and (c) in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 5. Parking facilities may be established in any section or portion of the District except that no parking facilities shall be established upon any property zoned residential without the approval of the Zoning Commission of the District. The Zoning Commission may grant such approval only after public notice and hearing in accordance with section 3 of the act entitled "An act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1938.

SEC. 6. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Highway Planning Survey Unit shall make available such records and factual data and make such additional surveys as the Commissioners or the agency may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. All fees and other moneys collected under this act, including all fees collected pursuant to section 11 of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1939, approved April 4, 1938 (52 Stat. 192), and all moneys derived from the sale or assignment of any property, real or personal, shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury of the United States entirely to the credit of the District of Columbia and shall be appropriated and used solely and exclusively for the purposes set forth in this act, including the reimbursement of the highway fund of the District for any moneys advanced therefrom to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. Appropriations from the highway fund of the District are hereby authorized to carry out the provisions of this act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and thereafter the Commissioners are authorized and directed to include in their annual estimates such amounts as may be required from said highway fund and the fund created by this act for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, including the payment of salaries and necessary administrative expenses. The Commissioners are authorized to employ a director and such other personal services as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and the salaries of such employees, other than members of said agency, are to be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Commissioners shall fix the compensation of the members of said agency without reference to the provisions of the Classification Act: *Provided, however*, That the compensation of any member shall not exceed \$500 per annum: *And provided further*, That no compensation for services as a member of such agency shall be provided for any member who holds a salaried public office or position in the District of Columbia or the Federal Governments.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 10. This act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 20, strike out "1" and insert "3."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter to me from the dean of Holy Cross College in Massachusetts, and also a resolution passed by the representatives of 45 institutions of higher learning in connection with the national youth college work program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COINAGE OF SILVER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday after I had left the floor, my good colleague from the State of Illinois, for whom I have an abiding affection, rose and offered an amendment, I might say the perennial amendment, to strike from the appropriation bill from the Treasury Department the appropriation to provide for the carrying on of the purchase of silver under existing law.

If there is any blind spot in our education in the United States, it is on the subject of money. Our schools seem to neglect that subject, and the ignorance on that particular question is abysmal. It is my wish that the Congressmen could give more attention and become better informed on the principles of money.

Just for the information of the Members, in discussing this amendment, which lacked only two votes of being carried, I would like to call attention to the figures in the daily balance sheet of the Treasury. In the first place, the figures of the daily balance sheet disclose that the Government is not losing any money and that it is not costing the Government a cent to carry out the provisions of the Silver Purchasing Act. By consulting the daily statement of the Treasury of January 31, 1942, we find under the heading of silver two items in assets, \$1,481,665,930.41 in silver, and silver dollars on hand of \$483,879,665 making a total of \$1,965,545,595.41 on the other side. Circulating against that are silver certificates outstanding of \$1,952,663,907; in Treasury notes of 1890, \$1,859,972; silver in the general fund, \$11,722,916.41. We find there is on hand in the Treasury \$1,965,545,595.41, and representing every dollar of that there is circulating in trade and business the equivalent in silver certificates, \$1, \$5, and \$10 bills.

The record discloses that as fast as the Treasury buys the silver it puts out its equivalent in money. This money is

put into circulation by paying the expenses of running the Government right here in the Capital of the United States, in paying the Members of Congress or in cashing their checks. We find they are paid in silver certificates issued out of this fund.

In addition to this there are profits to the Government in form of the extra silver bullion obtained at a price below the nominal value of the silver certificates issued against the silver. We find there is now on hand 1,258,390,378.09 ounces, which is carried on the Treasury statement as an item of \$662,093,054.57, a value allocated on estimated cost of the silver. This item represents idle silver in the Treasury which has been accumulated as a profit for the money paid out for the silver that has been put in circulation as silver certificates, and this is a clear profit to the Federal Government in buying silver at the domestic price of 71.11 and an average of around 35 cents in buying foreign silver.

If there is any money transaction of the Treasury on which the Government is making a profit, it is in carrying forward its silver-purchasing program. In this time when we owe \$50,000,000,000 and when the President has asked for another \$56,000,000,000 more to finance the war, it would seem to me that any transaction on which the Government is making a profit and piling up a reserve against its expanded currency should be continued, and that the statements made by the opponents of this program are more or less in error and we are carrying forward a great constructive program to stabilize our money system.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized as one of the metal experts in this Congress. I wonder if he has read the testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau before the Appropriations Committee concerning the fact that the industrial use of silver is increasing very greatly. He was regretting the fact that he is not able to put this silver into use which he has on hand. What does the gentleman think about the proposition of allowing the Treasury to dispose of this silver which is badly needed for industrial purposes? As a matter of fact, as I recall the testimony of the Secretary, the silver producers of Mexico are now selling silver to industrial concerns rather than selling it to the Government of the United States because they are getting a little more money for it. What is the gentleman's opinion on that?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman has asked that question. In the first place, every silver certificate that is put out by the Government is put out without being issued in the form of a loan, and carrying an interest charge, in contradistinction to the bulk of the currency of this country issued by the Federal Reserve banks, which is borrowed from the banks on interest-bearing obligations. Some people seem to think because they do not happen to pay that particular interest item in using that money that they are escaping that

interest, but I tell you that any man who goes into a store to make any transaction will pay a little pro rata of interest in the form of added cost that the banks exact from the man who borrows the money. Interest is inherent in the system of the Federal Reserve banks. We have now almost \$2,000,000,000 lying idle in the form of silver bullion in the Treasury, and we are going into debt and piling up an interest load on the people every day, but by putting that silver in use in paying Government expenses, by the issuance of silver certificates we could save the payment of that interest, and the Secretary of the Treasury might just as well, as fast as he acquires silver at present prices, issue it in the form of silver certificates so that the commercial business of this country could be transacted without having to pay any interest rate for the use of that kind of money. We are already carrying an interest load on \$50,000,000,000 as it is, and why not put the idle silver bullion into silver certificates instead of selling it out for commercial use, and thus put it to the use it has been put to from almost the dawn of civilization until recent times, and use it as money, and for every silver certificate the gentleman receives in payment at the Sergeant at Arms' office the Government stands ready with a silver dollar to redeem that certificate, and when this inflation, which seems to be impending, happens, the people who have silver may be fortunate that they have something besides paper, similar to the Hong Kong dollars, which were scattered about the streets of Hong Kong and not worth picking up, because no government was behind it. The only thing that supports our money today is the taxing power of this Congress. If some emergency or something would happen that would disturb this taxing power so that the Government would not have the power to pay the interest on the outstanding obligations, then your paper currency, except your silver certificates, would not be worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Would the gentleman object to the Secretary being permitted to dispose of this silver?

Mr. WHITE. He has the right now, under the law. It is his own imposed rule that he does not dispose of it in the way I suggest. If there is any such inhibition in law let us repeal it, let us put this \$2,000,000,000 of silver bullion to work, let it circulate in trade and relieve the people of the United States of that much interest load being piled upon their backs.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with the Secretary's statement?

Mr. WHITE. I have not read it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That he would be happy to see the whole silver program junked.

Mr. WHITE. Oh, I think that has been his attitude for some time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. As a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, which has handled the gold evaluation bill, and handled the extension of powers of the President to continue the stabilization fund, and the power to value the dollar, I was present when Mr. Morgenthau appeared before our committee to testify many times, and I divined all the time that he is not very friendly to silver.

Mr. CHENOWETH. He so stated.

Mr. WHITE. It has always been true and it has been proven over and over again, all down through the world's history, that there must be a redemption feature to paper currency of a country if its paper money is to be stable in value, and the gentleman will recall that the history of this country shows that after the Civil War when there was so much paper currency and Government obligations floated, there was a great agitation in respect to resuming specie payments. One Senator is reported to have said, "The way to resume is to resume."

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like the gentleman's observation on the large amount of silver we are buying from foreign countries and whether or not he thinks that should be continued?

Mr. WHITE. If we could get the foreign countries to return to the plan of the Latin union and standardize the money of the world, carry out the declared policy of the United States as it appears in the statutes, whereby it has declared the policy for international bimetallism, it would not be necessary to purchase foreign silver. But as long as we can get silver for 30 cents an ounce which the American people will gladly use in the channels of trade in the form of silver dollars or silver certificates at \$1.29 an ounce, I think it is a good bargain at the expense of the other country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman was here yesterday—

Mr. WHITE. No, I was not. I am sorry I was not. I wish I had been. I would like to have had the privilege of replying to the gentleman from Illinois who spoke yesterday.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman care to say something about the debate on the silver-purchase item, indicating that what we are really doing now is nothing but subsidizing a few silver purchasers, and the Secretary of the Treasury indicated that any worth for silver now is to use as covering for tin cans when there is such a shortage of tin? He would like to eliminate this legislation, which was nothing but a subsidy to a few silver producers.

Mr. WHITE. It is not half the subsidy as raising the price of gold from \$20.61 to \$35 an ounce was a subsidy to the South African producers where black labor is employed. Why should we discard our kind of money and use money from Africa? Seventy percent of the world's gold is produced under the British flag. There are 400,000,000 ounces of gold yet to be mined in Africa in proven reserves of the gold mines of the Rand, yet we must go out and finance the world,

including the British Empire. Mr. Morgenthau testified that we sent a battleship down to South Africa the other day to bring away that gold, but we must discard our silver which has been the money of humanity all down through the ages. If you will read an analysis which I put into the Record last Monday, February 2, you will get a better idea of what our money is.

Mr. STEFAN. But how about that subsidy?

Mr. WHITE. There is no more subsidy to the silver miners in this country than there is subsidy to the gold miners. If raising the price of gold \$15 an ounce was not a subsidy to somebody, I do not know what is.

Mr. STEFAN. That is an admission on your part that it is a subsidy.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. You are making a very clear argument about this subsidy paid for gold. I think it is unanswerable. The gentleman is very close to the President and the policies of the administration. Has he ever gone to the President and explained this matter and shown him wherein he was doing the wrong thing in subsidizing these people to whom the gentleman has so eloquently and so factually referred?

Mr. WHITE. I will say to the gentleman that we did go to the President. The trouble is he did most of the talking. In the emergency of collapse of business credit and the resultant depression, if our Government had done the logical thing and restored silver to our monetary system by remonetizing the metal, there would have been no need for increasing the price of gold as a subsidy to either the gold or silver miners—restore silver to use as money by remonetization and the miners could not supply the demand and our currency would be stabilized and commodity prices would be stabilized—and business would flourish.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to reiterate a suggestion which I have made several times on the floor of this House, and concerning which I wish to solicit your counsel and cooperation in putting it into practical effect. Insofar as I know, this suggestion was first made by Mr. Umstead, of North Carolina, who for several years rendered very distinguished service in the House of Representatives and retired voluntarily to practice his profession of law. In view of the fact that we are kept so very busy with the details and the multiplicity of our congressional labors, it is impossible for us to know definitely and accurately what is done with the various sums of money that we appropriate.

Mr. Umstead made a very pertinent suggestion, which I have emphasized from time to time, that there should be

appointed under the direction of the Committee on Appropriations a certain number of men on an annual basis to follow up these appropriations and see what is actually being done with the money, and whether or not some of it is being wasted, and whether or not too many agencies and employees are being used in its expenditure.

We have seen in the papers in recent days statements that Washington is crowded with people who have been called here and presumably given governmental employment, who have had nothing to do for weeks except twirl their thumbs. That may or may not be true. I do not know. You have seen the accounts in the press.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has been holding hearings for a few days with reference to necessary defense housing and public works in congested areas that naturally arise in these critical times in this metropolitan section by reason of the great influx of additional workers, and they have been estimated at a thousand a week. If unnecessary workers are coming here, we can relieve this housing situation somewhat by proper reduction of these forces and by not encouraging people to come to Washington as residents who do not have actual employment with the Government waiting for them. I think we can save many, many millions of dollars by having these follow-up men on appropriations to see what is done with the money and how it is spent.

Personally I shall look into the matter of the proper procedure to follow in getting that accomplished, and I am quite willing to sponsor necessary legislation or introduce the necessary resolution to see that some such action is taken. It is for the benefit of the American taxpayers who under the best circumstances are going to have a very burdensome load upon their backs during this emergency.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I think we all agree absolutely with the gentleman as to objective, and I hope that the word of warning he is giving today will have some effect. He must remember that all of these sums appropriated by the Congress are spent under Executive supervision, scrutiny, and direction. I am hoping that if the President learns for the first time that the millions of dollars to which the gentleman from Texas has referred are being spent needlessly that he will take the initiative in seeing that those who spend the money under his control will stop spending it in a wasteful manner.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I believe if we could have a more detailed supervision of the expenditure of these funds, if we had some agents of our own as the appropriating authority to follow them up, much good could be accomplished. I have understood that in some bureaus and agencies there have been unexpended balances, but that there has never been any very great activity in turning those unexpended balances back into the

Treasury. I think the usual policy has been to find some way in which to spend the money that is left over.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to get action with reference to this in the interest of economy, and certainly by such a policy, in my judgment, we can reduce our nondefense spending very materially. It has been said that everybody's business is nobody's business. I think we ought to make it the business of some specific authorized agents of our own to follow up through the year the expenditure of these funds in order that the Appropriations Committee may not have to accept without any knowledge of its own every estimate that is presented to that committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is to be congratulated upon the remarks he is making. I am glad he is bringing this matter up. Can the gentleman give us some idea of just how much the Government of the United States is in debt now?

Mr. LANHAM. I know, as does the gentleman, that the Government of the United States is in debt a very stupendous amount and that in striking a balance we lack a good many billions of dollars of having one red cent in the Treasury. I think it behooves us under these circumstances, in view of the fact that we are having to get this money from the American people, that the money is going to have to be repaid, and that our interest charges today on our debt amount to more than it costs to run this Government 40 years ago, I repeat, in view of all these things it behooves us not to accept without some kind of investigation the various items that are brought in to us, especially when the press is being filled these days with notices of people awaiting work being crowded into one room under Government employment who apparently have not been called upon to render any services and who just sit and twirl their thumbs all day. There is the complaint on the part of others who have been assigned to work that their work could be dispatched in an hour or less of any day. The people whom we represent are paying the bills.

Mr. O'CONNOR. One other question. I know, of course, what happens to an individual when he reaches the point where he no longer has any credit. He cannot get any money, and he goes bankrupt. I am wondering what will happen when we reach the point—when I say "we" I am referring to the United States Government—that we no longer can get any money?

Mr. LANHAM. Well, far be it from me to pose as a money expert. I have heard several of these experts speak on the floor of this House and elsewhere, and I

have never heard any two agree; but I do think we can concentrate our attention advantageously upon this matter of saving what we can for the taxpayers by reducing the nondefense expenditures and eliminating useless agencies and useless employees.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. A few moments ago the gentleman put his finger on what I consider to be one of the great defects in the present system. Congress has deteriorated into merely an organization that appropriates money, and in the nature of things we have no supervision, we have no scrutiny over the funds we appropriate. We are thus forced to take the word of the departments to whom we give the money. It seems to me the gentleman's suggestion ought to be given a great deal of serious consideration so that we of Congress, particularly of the Committee on Appropriations, may have some agents who can follow these funds and see that they are spent according to the directions of the Congress.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank my friend from Massachusetts. May I say in that connection that, unfortunately, in my judgment, it has become pretty much of a policy here for a committee of this House not to consider a bill that is introduced and referred to it if some agency down in the Federal Government service somewhere sends in an unfavorable report. The committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, I am glad to say, has reported and passed some legislation in the days gone by, though an adverse report had been sent here by some agent of the Federal Government.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman was in Congress, as I was, when the Budget system was adopted. That system provides a Budget Director for the President, whose job it is to scrutinize and bring together and coordinate all Government expenditures and submit his report to the Congress once a year. Along with that law was the congressional check, presumably on the spending of the money according to law, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts. That is the General Accounting Office. Our good friend and very capable former colleague, Mr. Warren, is today at the head of that organization.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not true that the General Accounting Office simply passes upon these various items coming before it to see whether or not the money is being spent in accordance with law?

Mr. MICHENER. One step further, and I cover that. Is not the trouble found in the fact that the Congress makes lump-sum appropriations and places the expenditure of their money in discretionary hands?

Mr. LANHAM. The Committee on Appropriations is kept very, very busy with its hearings and drafting its bills and pressing them through to enact-

ment. The members of the Committee on Appropriations with their duties in that service and the others that they have to perform as Members of this body are kept so constantly on the go that they cannot possibly have the information with reference to the details of these expenditures. It would cost relatively but a paltry sum, in my judgment, to employ a few experts under the direction of the Committee on Appropriations to follow up these expenditures. I think it is but a reasonable surmise that we can save for the taxpayers of this country many millions of dollars.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I think at this moment, with such large war expenditures being made, we could save not only millions but even billions through saving at the bung-hole of waste and inefficiency by having the agents the gentleman suggests act for the Congress.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Now that we are transferring a number of our agencies out of the city, would it not be well to make a survey to make sure what personnel are actually needed by the departments before sending them out of the city, and in that way save the Government considerable money? At the same time those employees who are not needed by the agencies could be used by the agencies that do need them here in Washington. Thereby we could cut down the influx of people into Washington.

Mr. LANHAM. Employees of the kind I have suggested can very easily get that information and have it available for the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Farm Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two particulars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROPOSAL TO MAKE MORE AVAILABLE SPACE FOR HOMES AND OFFICES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the preceding speaker referred

to a newspaper article which touched upon the limited accommodations available in office and dwelling space, here in the Nation's Capital. Another gentleman told us of problems connected with the parking of automobiles and garage space. In both instances, we were told that when there is a vacancy, the cost is almost prohibitive.

Last week President Roosevelt had something to say about "parasites" and the 20-room mansions on Massachusetts Avenue that might be put to better use during the national emergency.

The President could also include in his list, of those who should move out of Washington, another group not necessarily parasitic but who are responsible for a good part of the congestion in apartment and office space and street traffic. I have in mind the 600 private associations listed in the Washington Telephone Directory.

Many of these private associations occupy large suites of offices and in many cases whole buildings. I am sure that more than a million square feet of office space is occupied by these private groups. Included in this list are the religious, labor, fraternal, social, and business organizations.

I am sure no hardship would result to these organizations, if they transferred the headquarters to Baltimore, Wilmington, Philadelphia, New York City, Chicago, Richmond, or some other nearby city.

Let us consider just a few of these private associations or pressure groups; they are:

Anti-Saloon League, Anti-Cigarette Alliance, Society of the Mayflower Descendants, National Association of Deans of Women, National Cannery Association, National Clean-Up and Paint-Up Campaign, National Crushed Stone Association, National Duckpin Bowling Congress, American Peace Society, American Power Boat Association, American Vindicators, Birth Control Federation, Calf Tanners Association, Chamber of Commerce, Daughters of the American Revolution, Clay Sewer Pipe Association, Democratic National Committee, Republican National Committee, League for the Larger Life, National Association of Ice Industries, National Rifle Association, National Rural Letter Carriers Association, National Service Board for Conscientious Objectors, National Wooden Box Association, National Peanut Butter Association, Society of the Cincinnati, Society for Lonely Hearts, plus the army of palmists and astrologers.

We all know that the District of Columbia was established for one purpose, and that was for the transaction of the Federal Government's business. When Maryland in 1788 and Virginia in 1789 ceded certain land to be used as the seat of the Federal Government they did not intend or expect that the Federal departments would one day, in a national emergency, be forced out of Washington for lack of space due to encroachment of private associations.

During the past months, the spokesmen for the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations,

and the United States Chamber of Commerce have been pledging their very all to the President. They have graciously promised complete and wholehearted cooperation in the campaign to win the war. The unbearable conditions here in Washington due to the war effort, affords these groups a further opportunity to be of service. They should move their offices to some other nearby city and thus place at the disposal of the Government the space they now occupy and the apartments occupied by their employees. It would be a fine patriotic gesture and, at the same time, set an excellent example to the many other private associations occupying space in Washington, so badly needed by the Government for its war activities.

Of course, my proposal to move out of Washington is only for the duration of the war and is made in good faith to the many splendid organizations I have mentioned, which I am sure, will accept them in the same spirit.

I realize how difficult it is for a person to change his residence and move into new surroundings but that is a small sacrifice to make for the Government we all love. Every person should keep this fact in mind when he is asked to move, and I am sure that instead of being regarded as an onerous task it will be welcomed as an opportunity to display one's patriotism and willingness to serve his country. [Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLEBERG). The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MELVYN DOUGLAS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask that I be not interrupted until I have completed my address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that screen actors can do more for their country, in these difficult times, by carrying on in their accustomed ways than they can by coming to Washington, even for the purpose of adding glamour to the Office of Civilian Defense. The people of the United States do not need the inspiration of glamour to realize the seriousness of the situation we all face. Glamour is not needed to inspire our people to rally to the defense of our country, even through the Office of Civilian Defense. It seems to me a farce—yes, even a tragedy—to make of the Office of Civilian Defense a pink-tea party, where well-known faces of social life and on the screen can obtain added publicity.

From my viewpoint, the Office of Civilian Defense might well be headed by men who have had military experience and women who have had broad executive experience in civic pursuits. Certainly it should not be a catch-all for persons without such experience, but whose names may be well known in the society columns or in the klieg lights.

I see by the papers that screen actor Melvyn Douglas has been appointed to a position in the Office of Civilian Defense.

Having thus stepped into the official family in Washington, Melvyn Douglas is subject to being looked upon with the same careful scrutiny that is commonly accorded other officials of the United States Government. I have known of Melvyn Douglas for a number of years in California, and as he has been, in recent years, an active campaigner there in political circles, it has been deemed advisable to find out who he was.

Melvyn Douglas is the husband of Miss Helen Gahagan, another star of great fame, charm, and personality. Miss Gahagan doubles as democratic national committeewoman from California.

According to the latest volume of Who's Who, Melvyn Douglas was born in Macon, Ga., April 5, 1901, the son of Edouard G. and Lena (Shackelford) Hesselberg. Melvyn Edouard Hesselberg, on July 21, 1937, in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, legally changed his name to Melvyn Douglas. What his activities were, prior to that time, could probably be checked if one had the inclination. I do not say that Melvyn Douglas is or ever has been a Communist, but he has been associated with organizations and movements which, according to the records of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, are Communist sponsored or led, and are generally considered to be Communist-front organizations. The Daily Worker of April 8, 1938, on page 4, lists Melvyn Douglas as a signer of a petition to lift the arms embargo against Spain, and as a member of an organization known as American Friends of Spanish Democracy. In 1939, he is recorded as an endorser and supporter of an organization known as the American Congress for Peace and Democracy. On February 13, 1939, he was a speaker at a public meeting at Carnegie Hall, New York, sponsored by the Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts. He is listed as being associated in some capacity with the Consumers Union. He was a signer of the call of what is known as the First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples of the United States. He was one of those who welcomed Tom Mooney when the latter was released from prison in California, and it is well known that Tom Mooney was both identified with disloyal groups in the last war, and is now national chairman of the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder. According to press reports, he was one of those who aided the defense of Harry Bridges, and in 1939 bought radio time to broadcast Harry Bridges' side of his own story. Melvyn Douglas is listed as a member of the executive board of the Motion Picture Artists' Committee, and has been chairman and a member of the Directorate of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee. Among the members of that Directorate, who are either known or believed to be members of the Communist Party or Fellow Travelers of the same are the following: Herbert Biberman, Maurice Murphy, John Bright, Jeff Kibbre, Al Matthews, Charles Page, and Donald Ogden Stewart.

On May 21, 1940, Los Angeles papers carried the report:

Melvyn Douglas, film actor and leader of Hollywood's "left wing" group, and five mem-

bers of Governor Olson's official family were given commissions yesterday in the California National Guard. Douglas, who resigned as a member of the State welfare commission, was named lieutenant colonel of intelligence.

Douglas had been elected a delegate to the Democratic national convention on Governor Olson's third-term ticket for delegates and had been a warm sponsor of the Governor in the 1938 elections. Following the vociferous protests of many loyal California citizens, among whom were found many leaders in the American Legion and other veteran organizations, the appointment of Melvyn Douglas was quashed, according to reports, at his own request.

In the records of the Federal Communications Commission Melvyn Douglas is listed in an application made for a permit to build and operate a 10,000-watt radio station in Pasadena, Calif., as one of the sponsors and subscribers, with the intention of becoming one of the directors. In that application it is stated as follows:

Another one of the subscribers to take stock in KFVD (now KPAS), and who will be one of the directors, is peculiarly fitted to aid in making a broadcasting station a success, both from an entertainment point of view and of service along civic lines. This man is Melvyn Douglas, the actor. Mr. Douglas not only stands high in his profession but his study and interest in civic affairs makes him of great value. Mr. Douglas expects to devote considerable attention to this new broadcasting station appearing on it professionally, and also speaking over it as a citizen interested in civic affairs. In fact, he has agreed to go on each week with a commercial program under a sponsor, taking no money therefor for himself, but granting the station the profits from his part in such effort to be used to put on other civic programs that might be of value to the hearers, and yet such that might not be sponsored by any commercial advertiser.

Mr. Douglas is doing this because of his confidence that those who will be immediately responsible and will have control of this new enterprise are men and women who have the interests of the public and the value of a radio station for the public good at heart.

Mr. J. Frank Burke, the principal stockholder and the very able manager of this enterprise, radio station KPAS, was formerly greatly interested in the election campaign of Culbert Olson in his race for the governorship of California. He is a very estimable citizen, held in high regard by those who know him, including myself. Radio station KPAS makes its initial bow to the public on next Thursday, February 5, 1942.

As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, I do not know that Melvyn Douglas is a Communist or a fellow traveler of the Communist Party, nor am I willing to believe that he is either of these or that he is even a sympathizer of the Communist principles. Until such fact, if true, is amply demonstrated, if he is not any of these things—and I am willing to believe that he is not—then the least that can be said is that he has amply demonstrated his very left-wing tendencies.

If Melvyn Douglas were purely and simply a screen actor of color and personality, which he is acknowledged to possess, I would still be opposed to his

appointment to a position in the Office of Civilian Defense, for I do not believe that such positions should be held by persons without broad executive experience. Certainly when one considers Douglas' outside activities and his relation to the political picture, in addition to his known vocational experience especially as an actor, it would hardly seem fit that such a person should be given the responsibility now resting upon him. There are many capable persons of long experience who are far better qualified. Again, I say, glamour is not what is needed in the Office of Civilian Defense—that is serious business.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RANDOLPH, for 2 days, an account of official business.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 984. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James C. Loard; to the Committee on Claims.
S. 1801. An act for the relief of Eugene Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1898. An act for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Nazaria Garcia, of Winslow, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2002. An act for the relief of Donald William Burt; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2068. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2198. An act to provide for the financing of the War Damage Corporation, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Report of the Commission Appointed by the President of the United States To Investigate the Facts Relating to the Attack Made by the Japanese Armed Forces Upon Pearl Harbor in the Territory of Hawaii, on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Printing.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of Edna La Blanche Gillette;

H. R. 1903. An act for the relief of Reuben Owen;

H. R. 1914. An act for the relief of the Copel Coal Co.;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of Paul E. Cook;

H. R. 2376. An act for the relief of Ethel Ray Sowder;

H. R. 3118. An act for the relief of the State compensation insurance fund of California;

H. R. 3403. An act for the relief of Louis M. McDougal;

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of Mollie S. McHaney;

H. R. 4436. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bertha M. Smith;

H. R. 5046. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Saunders;

H. R. 5085. An act for the relief of Esco Wood;

H. R. 5164. An act for the relief of Arthur W. Jorgenson, and the legal guardian of Robert R. Jorgenson, a minor;

H. R. 5291. An act for the relief of Helen Rauch and Max Rauch;

H. R. 5390. An act for the relief of G. T. Elliott, Inc.;

H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of Joseph Keeney;

H. R. 5701. An act for relief of the accounts of Lt. Col. Joseph M. Kelly, United States property and disbursing officer for Kentucky;

H. R. 5767. An act for the relief of A. Paul Johnson; and

H. R. 6356. An act to amend the act approved October 24, 1941, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes" (Public Law No. 280, 77th Cong.), so as to remove the limitation on the sum authorized to be appropriated annually to effectuate the purposes of the act.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 294. An act to authorize an appropriation for payment to the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of construction costs assessed against certain lands within such district acquired by the United States for the benefit of certain Indians in the State of New Mexico;

S. 828. An act to increase the period for which leases may be made of public lands granted to the State of Idaho for educational purposes by the act of July 3, 1890;

S. 1045. An act to increase the earnings of the United States Government Life Insurance fund and the National Service Life Insurance fund by expediting the investment of the moneys thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1412. An act to amend the act of June 11, 1940 (Public, No. 590, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), providing for the relief of Indians who have paid taxes on allotted land;

S. 2012. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, to the State of Maine, for road-widening purposes;

S. 2080. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Murfreesboro, Tenn., to Rutherford County, Tenn., for highway purposes;

S. 2112. An act authorizing overtime pay for certain employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; and

S. 2217. An act to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 5, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6020, granting the consent and approval of Congress to an

interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 12, 1942, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 263, to provide decorations for outstanding conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, February 17, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6503, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1370. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the protection of Indian tribal organizations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1371. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting certain amendments to certain estimates of appropriations included in the Budget for the fiscal year 1943 for the legislative establishment, Library of Congress, involving an increase of \$15,930 in such estimates (H. Doc. No. 608); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. House Resolution 125 (77th Cong., 1st sess.). Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 1741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 3141. A bill for the relief of Fred Farner and Ernest Schroeder (Rept. No. 1742). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 4622. A bill for the relief of Catharine Schultze (Rept. No. 1743). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. REES of Kansas: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6450. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 155), as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 1935. An act to amend section 602 (m) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (Public, No. 801, 78th Cong.); as amended, to enable a person in active service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard to secure such insurance effective as of date of application by advance of active service pay, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 6526. A bill to repeal section 2 of Public Law 386 (77th Cong., ch. 638, 1st sess.), being an act to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 6527. A bill to provide that veterans of the present war shall receive the same domiciliary or hospital care as veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 6528. A bill to further amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 6529. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to permit the Commissioner to furnish copies of any part of the records or information therefrom to agencies or officials of a State without charge; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 6530. A bill creating the Wilmington Tunnel Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a tunnel under the Delaware River at or near Wilmington, Del.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6531. A bill to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of tariff duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 430. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript of a hearing held before a special committee who conducted an investigation relative to the supply and considered plans to increase the production of lead for national defense as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2375. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution of the Assembly and Senate of New York State, urging careful consideration to the manifold qualifications which make the city and State of New York an eminently desirable place for the relocation of Federal Government agencies removed from Washington, D. C., and to make such selection wherever appropriate and possible; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2376. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the board of aldermen, Chelsea, Mass., urging that funds be provided by the Federal Government to cover expenses necessary in arranging for the defense of city and towns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2377. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the common council of the city of Yonkers, N. Y., that the common council stresses the seriousness of the situation in threatened lay-offs and appeals for immediate action in the awarding of defense contracts to the Alexander Smith & Sons Carpet Co., the Saunders Machine & Tool Co., the Otis Elevator Co., and the Habirshaw Cable & Wire Co., so that the citizens of Yonkers who are not able to take up arms against our foes may contribute their share by working in the mills; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2378. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California Retail Jewelers Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif., opposing the proposal

by the Social Security Board to federalize the California unemployment-insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, February 2, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Chaplain Merritt F. Williams, United States Navy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, strong to save, who hast formed all hearts to love Thee, we stand before Thee as Thy sons. We give Thee our thanks for Thy great goodness to us and to all men. Thou hast safely brought us to the beginning of a new day and hast blessed us above all that we deserve. As we take up the tasks of the day, we ask Thy never failing help. Our presence before Thee is our prayer. Thy knowledge of our need is the measure of our petition. Grant us to know and to do Thy will. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, February 3, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on February 3, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2028. An act to amend section 3 (a) of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved June 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 800), so as to transfer the administration of the naval supply depot Oakland, to the commandant, twelfth naval district; and

S. 2139. An act to provide for performance of the duties of chiefs of bureau and the Judge Advocate General in the Navy Department, and the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 381. An act for the relief of Marcel M. Roman, Clara M. Roman, and Rodica E. Roman;

S. 806. An act for the relief of Carmella Ridgewell;

S. 1523. An act for the relief of the Portland Sportwear Manufacturing Co.;

S. 1654. An act for the relief of the Merchants Distilling Corporation;

S. 1771. An act for the relief of R. V. Thurston and Joseph Hardy, a partnership;

S. 1778. An act for the relief of Leslie Truax;

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugh G. Nicholson;

S. 1974. An act for the relief of Francis Howard Robinson; and

S. 2011. An act for the relief of Willard R. Centerwall, formerly superintendent and special disbursing agent at the Tongue River Indian Agency.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 314) for the relief of certain Basque aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1945) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire, operate, and regulate public off-street parking facilities, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5833) to extend the time during which orders and marketing agreements under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, may be applicable to hops.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6460) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 10, 25, and 26 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 5 and 27 and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

H. R. 1374. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal;

H. R. 1988. An act for the relief of Albert Barrett;

H. R. 2430. An act for the relief of John Huff;

H. R. 2980. An act for the relief of National Heating Co., Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 3295. An act for the relief of Kurt G. Stern;

H. R. 3469. An act for the relief of Maria Azucena Alvarez Canga;

H. R. 3610. An act for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders;

H. R. 4354. An act for the relief of D. H. Dantzier;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky;

H. R. 4896. An act for the relief of David B. Byrne;

H. R. 5071. An act for the relief of Catharina Migliore and Anthony and Rose Migliore;

H. R. 5478. An act for the relief of Nell Mahoney;

H. R. 5539. An act for the relief of Umberto Danta Annibali;

H. R. 5572. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees